W. E. Gladstone

St. Deiniol's Library

CANCELLED

Hawarden, Clwyd

Founded by

The Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone

G
22 Am
8

.31
c. 1

117 &c

Eucharist (history)

Epiclesis

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/concecrationofeu0000henr

THE CONSECRATION OF THE EUCHARIST

THE CONSECRATION OF THE EUCHARIST

A STUDY OF THE

PRAYER OF CONSECRATION

IN THE

COMMUNION OFFICE

FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE

ALTERATIONS AND AMENDMENTS ESTABLISHED THEREIN BY THE REVISERS OF 1789

BY THE

REV. HENRY RILEY GUMMEY, JR., D.D.

RECTOR OF GRACE CHURCH, HADDONFIELD
NEW JERSEY

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE

REV. WILLIAM JONES SEABURY, D.D.

CHARLES AND ELIZABETH LUDLOW PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY AND LAW IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

PHILADELPHIA
THE HENRY F. ANNERS PRESS
LONDON
THE DE LA MORE PRESS
1908

42765

Copyright, 1907,
By HENRY RILEY GUMMEY, JR.

All rights reserved.

Printed by the
Wickersham Printing Co.,
Lancaster, Pa., U. S. A.

To

THE RIGHT REVEREND

OZI WILLIAM WHITAKER, D.D., LL.D.

BISHOP OF PENNSYLVANIA

INTRODUCTION

8 Chelsea Square, New York,
Christmas Eve, 1906.

The Rev. Henry Riley Gummey, Jr., D.D.,

My dear Doctor:

Your gracious request that I should contribute something by way of introduction to your book in regard to the use of the Invocation in the Prayer of Consecration in the Eucharistic Service confers great honour upon me. Both my regard for you and my appreciation of the value of your work combine, however, to make me wish that you had made choice of some other pen than mine to perform this important office. It seems hardly possible that anything which I am able to say should be either necessary by way of explication of what you have written, or instrumental in extending the knowledge or acceptance of it. But since it is your wish thus to associate me with your labours, and since I am conscious of deep interest both in the subject which you have treated, and in the manner in which you have treated it, I do not think myself justified in declining to give expression to some of the thoughts which your discussion has suggested, or at least brought freshly home to my mind. And if such expression can in any way serve to the better appreciation of the need and usefulness of your work, it will afford me sincere pleasure.

It is not to be expected that after so many years of controversy in regard to the nature and meaning of the Holy Eucharist, both in general and in detail, anything new can be devised either in the way of misconstruction and perversion, or of explanation and defence: and accordingly, the

question which lies back of your argument is so old as to have been in dispute for many centuries; to have been instrumental in maintaining the great schism between East and West; and to have been the subject of divers opposing views in different parts of those main divisions.

It is admitted by those who regard the Holy Eucharist as the divinely appointed memorial of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, that in perpetuating this memorial the Church is bound to carry out the will of its Divine Founder in the institution of it. But, apart from other differences in regard to the will of Christ in this matter, there is the particular question whether the Church is to carry out that will by the appointed use of Bread and Wine in imitation of the act of Christ with or without words; and, if with words, as appears to have been conceded, then with what words: whether only with those words which He Himself is recorded to have used; or also with words of such character as, though not expressly recorded, it is apparent from the record that He did use. Or, as the question is practically and specifically put, does the repetition in the Eucharist of the words of Institution as they are called, effect the consecration of the Bread and Wine appointed to be used; or is it further necessary, strictly speaking, that the Holy Spirit should be invoked to operate upon, and make operative to their proper end these appointed elements?

It is the purpose of your argument to maintain that it is the duty of the Church, in its effort to fulfil the will of Christ in the perpetuation of this memorial, to use for the consecration of the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist not only the words which our Lord used in the Institution: "This is my Body," etc., but also to use with those words such further words as pray that the Holy Spirit will sanctify those elements in respect of which Christ used His words of Institution to the end which He designed in that Institution. It does not seem to me proper that I should here anticipate your argument, or seek to add either to its force, or to the citations with which your learning has sustained

it. But it may perhaps open the way to the readier and more just appreciation of the argument, if some preliminary consideration be bestowed upon the nature and design of the Service to which it relates.

To the casual reader of the story of Christ as recorded in the New Testament it might appear that His last Supper with the twelve whom He had associated with Him, was a solemn and tender ending of their companionship, and an event which He wished them to cherish in their memories of a friend whom they were soon to lose. That His words, however, were not only general and abstract, but spoken together with His use of Bread then broken by Him, and of Wine which had been poured into the cup then held by Him, while He declared the one to be His Body broken, and the other His Blood shed, would suggest to any except the most thoughtless that there was a connection between the two in each case which, whatever its nature, purported something more than mere associations of personal friendship brought to a sad and never-to-be-forgotten conclusion in a farewell refreshment.

To those who, recognizing this indication, found it in accord with their belief in the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, there might come the conviction that the purpose of His action was to leave behind Him, in foreknowledge of His crucifixion, a means by which His disciples might always keep within their holy remembrance the death which He had suffered for them. Thus the Bread broken and the Wine poured out would be to them a picture, or presentation to the mind, of that death, accomplished by the separation of His Body and Soul, figured by the Bread — the emblem of His Body, separated from the Wine — the emblem of His Blood — the Blood being "the life." To such a believer this might be a sufficient explanation of the act performed, and of the reason of the act performed, in the last Supper: his eating and drinking of the elements would be resolved into an act of obedience to a command; and memory, refreshed by renewed obedience, would strengthen

his faith in the Sacrifice of the Cross thus figured before him.

If, however, the believer in the Sacrifice of the death of Christ realized that this very expression involved offering to the Father, he might be conscious that the memorial of that Sacrifice enjoined in the last Supper would be as lively a figure or depiction of it to the mind of the Father, as to that of the disciples of Christ. Whether it were necessary that such memorial should be made to God, would be a separate question; but the fitness of the memorial for the setting forth of the Sacrifice would be as proper and complete in the case of presentation to the Father, as in the case of presentation to the disciples. Hence the connection between the elements of Bread and Wine and the Body and Blood of Christ in His action of the Supper, would suggest the connection of the offering of the one with the offering of the other; and that what Christ really did in the Supper was to offer to the Father that Body and Blood of His Sacrifice which He declared the Bread and Wine to be. If this were so, the memorial which He desired to be perpetuated would be the offering of Bread and Wine to picture to the Father the offering of the Body and Blood depicted by those elements; or, conversely, the offering of the Body and Blood under those forms or representations of them which Christ appropriated and empowered for the purpose. Such a conception as this would obviously involve the idea of the sacrificial action of our Lord at the Supper; which would be in conformity with the type of the Passover which He was then fulfilling, in conformity also with His use of terms of the present and not of the future in referring to His Body and Blood as at that very time given and shed, and in conformity further with the overwhelming significance of the fact that from that time on He is no longer a free agent, but simply passive in the hands of those who fulfilled the predetermined crucifixion; so that if Christ did not at that time offer Himself, there is no evidence in the historical record of His having offered Himself at all. And it would

seem equally obvious that this sacrificial action of our Lord would involve the offering both of the elements, and of that which they were appointed to represent; of the Bread and Wine as representing the Body and Blood, of the Body and Blood as represented by the Bread and Wine. But, if such were the significance of the action of Christ in the Supper, which action He commanded to be imitated or reënacted; such would be the significance of that which was afterwards done in the Church in obedience to His command.

I am far from presuming to describe the process of the mind of the Church in its fulfilling of the command of Christ in the continued observance of the Holy Eucharist: but it seems to be matter of fact that the universal Church from the earliest times of its known history has regarded that Service as a Sacrifice; as a Sacrifice of the creatures of Bread and Wine, both in their material character and in their representative character as appointed and empowered to be for that purpose the Body and Blood of Christ; and thus, as the Sacrifice instituted by Christ for memorial before the Father of His one oblation of Himself once offered. It is true that this Sacrifice having been always offered with prayers and praises and thanksgivings, and with the devotion of ourselves to God, some in later times have conceived of the Christian Sacrifice as consisting only of the offering of ourselves and of our prayers and praises. But, notwithstanding some historical instances of special emphasis upon these, it would seem that there has always been in the mind of the Church the consciousness that these, in and by themselves, were not acceptable to God; and that they needed, in order to their acceptance, to be associated with the offering of the Sacrifice of Christ; so that they are always offered for acceptance through Him and His Sacrifice, and thus, most eminently, in connection with the Sacrifice of the Eucharist — the Oblation in which becomes the medium of their acceptance.

So far as my reading has been enabled to instruct me, there is no question but that the Church always and every-

where and with the concurrence of all adhering to its communion until the times of later disagreement has understood that it was fulfilling the command of Christ at the Institution by offering the Sacrifice of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist to the Father of all, *first* as creatures, to agnize Him as the Giver of all good; and *secondly* as creatures specially set apart to the appointed use of representing before the Father the Body and Blood of the Sacrifice of Christ completed on the Cross: so that the offering of the Church in the Eucharist has been *first* material, and *secondly* mystical; *first* of the Bread and Wine, and *secondly*, though of course chiefly, of the Body and Blood signified thereby. The Church offers then in this Sacrifice not only Bread and Wine, but also the Body and Blood of Christ; the one in fact, the other in mystical significance — though both in equal reality in their several kinds.

I need not qualify or explain these expressions. I am speaking of the common judgment of the Church that the Sacrifice is offered not only as material, but also as mystical; and to present before the Father by way of memorial the one perfect and sufficient Sacrifice of Christ as He appointed it to be presented. And I believe it to be correct to say that in the exercise of this judgment the Eastern and Roman and Anglican Churches have always in their Liturgies made provision for the oblation of the Bread and Wine as such, the Eastern and Roman Churches providing also for the oblation of the Bread and Wine in their mystical import as made by Christ's appointment to be His Body and Blood. In the case of the Anglican Churches, excepting the Scottish and American members of that group, while there is no formal oblation in this import, yet it cannot fail to be inferred to be within the intent of those Churches from the mere fact of their professing in their consecration to continue that perpetual memory which Christ instituted, with the means used by Him for the Institution, and with the words used by Him in the Institution.

In all these cases, with so far as I know one ancient ex-

ception, of somewhat doubtful application, the use of the words of Institution is accounted sufficient to confer upon the elements that character which qualifies them to be received by the Father as the memorial which the Son has commanded to be made before Him of the one oblation of Himself once offered. The words of Institution originally used by Him to confer upon the material creatures of Bread and Wine the capacity of representing the Body and Blood offered to the Father, have by His appointment the same effect in the same use of them by the Church. The Bread and Wine not ceasing to exist in either instance, become by the designation of those words of Institution in a true but mystical sense, the Body and Blood of Christ offered in Sacrifice to the Father. In the Supper, the Bread and Wine still existing were declared by Christ to be His Body and Blood broken and shed; yet His Body unbroken with His Blood as yet unshed were present at the same time. It remains that the Bread and Wine were His Body and Blood for the purpose of that Sacrifice; and that by His authoritative words they acquired the character or capacity of being such for that purpose. And it seems to have been the judgment of the Church that the use of the same words by His commandment, accomplished the same purpose in the Eucharist; making the Bread and Wine to have, in addition to that which they had by nature, the character or capacity of being the Body and Blood of Christ for the purpose of the offering then made — which by the same command was the purpose of memorial of that already consummated once for all, but forever presented and pleaded both in Heaven and on earth.

Thus it may appear that the Christian Church, in common with its forerunners of the Patriarchal and Mosaic Dispensations, has never lacked the characteristic of Sacrifice in its worship: nor has the Christian Sacrifice, more than either the Patriarchal or Mosaic Sacrifices, failed to be a material Sacrifice. The difference is that the material Sacrifice of Christian worship has been made the medium and

instrument of a higher spirituality, and of the more specific offering of that Sacrifice of Christ which the Sacrifices of the previous Dispensations dimly shadowed, but the very image of which is by way of memorial set forth before the Father in the mystical import grafted by the Son upon the gifts and creatures of the Bread and Wine of the Paschal Supper. It is unnecessary for the present purpose, though it would be a study of interest and edification, to consider the exact correspondence of the Sacrifices of previous Dispensations with the Christian Sacrifice. But one can hardly forbear a passing comment upon the strangeness of the fact that, notwithstanding these often demonstrated correspondences; notwithstanding too the universal practice of the religious systems of the world — for what Religion was ever without Sacrifice? — there should be in modern religious thought an aversion to the idea of Sacrifice in Christian worship; and, particularly, so great contempt of the idea of a material Sacrifice in that worship. Most perverted conceptions of spirituality surely are those which would presume to substitute human feelings, human aspirations, human words, emanating from that most deceitful of all things the human heart, for that simple obedience which is involved in compliance with the positive Divine institution of the offering of the Eucharistic Bread and Wine with their mystical import of the Body and Blood of Christ. This, after all, is not only the true worship, but the true spiritual worship; since it was the one form of worship instituted by Him Who taught that those who would worship the Father must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

It is true indeed that our Lord also taught His disciples a form of prayer; but prayer is not essentially, or in itself, worship. It is rather an incident of, or an attendant upon, the worship whereby it is conveyed and becomes acceptable. And no other form of worship except the Christian Sacrifice did our Lord institute; nor has the Church ever regarded her own prayers and thanksgivings — not even the Lord's prayer which she has always used with it — as sub-

stitutes for that instituted worship, but only as reverent and becoming appendages to it.

But while the great witness of the Church East and West —practically undivided as to this — is a standing protest against this modern depravation of Christian worship, it is not so clear in regard to another aspect of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as to which there has come to be an almost equal want of appreciation. And that the force of the Church's testimony to the truth in this respect has been somewhat impaired may, perhaps, be largely due to the disagreement between East and West for many centuries as to that question which it is your endeavour in the following pages to elucidate; the question, namely, of the duty of invoking the Holy Spirit upon the oblations of Bread and Wine in the Eucharistic offering.

There are two essentially distinct, though mutually operating functions of the Redeeming work of Christ, which, naturally, are manifest in the means by which He has condescended to make that work applicable to His disciples. He represents Himself, and is represented in the whole prophetic and historical delineation of His work, as our Redeemer; as having purchased by the Sacrifice of Himself our exemption from the penalties in which we were justly involved, and from the power of the Evil One under whose bondage mankind had fallen. His work, therefore, is that of Atonement, and of the reconciliation of God with man. He is also presented to us as performing the corresponding work of reconciling man to God, and of imparting to man such grace as may enable him to overcome evil with good, and to become acceptable to God in the participation of His righteousness. So that His Sacrifice, based upon and expressing His Redemptive covenant with the Father, is both an atonement or expiation for our sin, and also a gift, to those who in faith and love will receive it, of the participation of His own life in which we are accepted with Him. And the grace which by His Sacrifice is procured for us is ministered to us by the Holy

Spirit, whom He sends to us from the Father. Accordingly, He impressed upon His disciples, and explained to them so far as they could bear it, not only that He was to be offered in Sacrifice for the sins of the world, but also that His offering was to be received back as a means of life to the world. And nothing, surely, but His thinking in the language of Sacrifice could account for His very plain and *unique* teaching as to Himself being the "Bread of life which came down from Heaven"; and as to the Bread which He would give being His Flesh which He would "give for the life of the world."

Standing therefore at the close of the Mosaic Dispensation, and having with His disciples religiously partaken of the Paschal Lamb prefiguring His own Sacrifice, as of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world and which taketh away the sins of the world, the Christ not only designates the Bread of the Paschal offering as His Body and the Wine offered with it as His Blood, but also with words of blessing and thanksgiving equivalent to sanctification, He gives back those Holy Gifts, in mystic import His Body and Blood, to become their spiritual food and sustenance. As in the Paschal rite, the Lamb offered had been received again and eaten; so here in the foundation of the Christian Sacrifice that which is offered with Christ's designation as His Body and Blood is received again to be reverently consumed.

It is in the light of this idea, that that which, in establishment of solemn covenant, is offered to God in the way of Sacrifice by His worshippers is received back by His gracious gift for their refreshment, that we seem to get the clearest conception of the nature of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ and of the nature of that Sacrifice which He ordained for its perpetual memorial. Christ, obedient unto death, yea even unto the death of the Cross, is to offer Himself; and the offering, accepted for our Redemption, is to be given back for our salvation — for the sustenance in us of the life which is in Him; for the preservation of

body and soul unto the life everlasting. And, therefore, at the last Supper, in view of the consummation of this offering and in present fulfilment of it and of its application, He devotes Himself; voluntarily laying down the life which otherwise no man had taken from Him; exhibiting in a mystery His Body broken and His Blood shed; and, in the continuance of His priestly function, gives back to those who were associated with Him in that sublime act of worship that which had been offered, that it might be by them consumed. And this which He had done, He commanded them in all its true significance to do for a memorial of Him.

In full realization of this federal idea, the general characteristic of Sacrifice, the Church has ever perpetuated the memorial thus instituted; offering in the ordained memorial mystery of Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ's Sacrifice, and then giving back for the manducation of the faithful in the same mystery that which has been previously offered.

Now if this Sacrifice were merely material, the Bread and Wine offered to God might conceivably without any expressed words be received back for refreshment in token of participation in our sacred covenant with Him, as would appear for the most part to have been the case with the material Sacrifices of preceding Dispensations. But since the materials here used are symbolical, and since the offering is not only of the symbols but also of that which they symbolize, and since that which we receive back for our refreshment is not merely the symbols but that also which is symbolized, there is certainly need of some operation to impress upon those symbols the special character whereby they become effectual means of imparting that which they symbolize. By nature they are Bread and Wine. By designation and appointment of the Divine authority of Christ they become mystically the Body and Blood of His offering. By the exercise of Divine power they are returned to us impressed with the character or capacity of being the

effectual means of our participation of the Body and Blood of Christ offered for us.

From the earliest ages it seems that the Church has always recognized the operation of this Divine power in enabling these symbols to communicate to us that which they were ordained to symbolize. In the simplicity of original faith, not needing to be guarded against the subtle perversions of later controversy, the difference between the symbols and the things symbolized was wont to be plainly expressed as the difference — produced by consecration — between Bread and Wine, and the Body and Blood of Christ. And the change effected by the consecration was, and indeed always has been in one form or other, attributed to the Divine power, and not to human capacity. Living in the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and recognizing Him as the Lord and Giver of life, and the source of all sanctification and effectual operation in the fulfilment of the Divine Will on earth, it was natural that in the freshness of its unsullied faith the early Church should attribute to His operation the sanctification of the memorial offerings of the Eucharist to the effectual participation in the precious gifts denoted by them; and that to this end it should invoke the Holy Spirit in words of solemn prayer. This it certainly did. This the Eastern Church has continually done. This, by the singular grace and providence of God, the American Use — derived by tradition from these venerable sources through the agency of the Scottish Church influenced by the fleeting vision of the light which shone in the first gleams of the English Reformation — has been enabled to express in most fitting and exalting form; to God's great glory and our own ineffable benediction.

That the great Roman Communion should have departed, in so important a particular of the venerable Sacrament of Christian Unity, from the traditional usage of other ancient Churches; and, as there is good reason to believe, from her own original integrity in this respect, is matter of profound grief.

That the English Church should have submitted to have the voice of her clear testimony, in the dawn of the Reformation, to this primitive usage stifled by the malevolent repressions of Continental reformers playing, consciously or unconsciously, into the hands of Roman manipulators of Catholic truth, is matter of grief mingled with just resentment.

That it should have become possible to find inheritors of the renewed tradition of the ancient testimony in the American Use, capable of belittling, and with carping words disparaging that tradition to which they have had the undeserved grace of succeeding is matter which, however lamentable, is after all merely consequent upon the two already mentioned.

Doubtless God, all merciful and infallibly discerning the thoughts and intents of the heart, can and does receive and respond to the effort of the Church in all times and in all places to do for His memorial that which Christ commanded to be done; and His gift of the grace of the Body and Blood of Christ is effectually administered by His Holy Spirit in recognition of that effort, with whatever imperfections made. Were the case otherwise, who could have confidence in any offering of worship, however faithfully made, or however intentionally based on the Divine command. But the cherishing of this conviction in all humility, should not hinder our devout and painstaking effort to ascertain always, so nearly as our powers and our sources of information permit, what provision God has made for His own worship, and in what manner He desires us to seek the blessings which He is fain to bestow. And when in regard to any particular of such service we find all the analogies of the Divine Revelation substantiated and applied in the usage of the Church in the ages nearest to the close of that Revelation, we may not weakly surrender the teaching of that tradition to the subtleties of later ages, nor at the dictation of an unauthorized assumption of dominion over our faith.

To the explanation and maintenance of one such most important tradition you have devoted your faithful endeavours; and it is in token of my desire to further these endeavours, in such wise as I can, that I venture to submit to the preliminary consideration of your readers the general account of the nature and design of the Holy Eucharist which I have now concluded. It has not been without hesitation that I have presumed to express myself upon a subject of such profound meaning, and as to which there have been so great differences among godly and well learned men. But as in the process of time the point of view in which truth is regarded is continually shifting, so there is the constantly recurring obligation to renew the witness to that truth with the closest adherence to its elementary and original significance which we can possibly attain. Thus to speak involves, to my mind, the reception with implicit faith of that which has been revealed, as interpreted by the witness of most primitive tradition, and in a sense conformable to right reason. That which is thus revealed and witnessed may sometimes be beyond the power of reason fully to understand, but is not on that account repugnant or contrary to reason: and our faith is only distinguished from superstition, as laying hold upon that which is in itself reasonable, though beyond the invention of reason. Never based upon reason as its authority, a true faith is necessarily consonant with reason: otherwise it ceases to be faith in the proper sense of that word, and becomes superstition. This is true not only in regard to specific parts of the scheme of Redemption like the Eucharist, but in regard to the very scheme of Redemption itself. The whole scheme and all its essential parts are in a certain proper sense artificial; being not natural, but supernatural. It is in that view of them, indeed, that they are sometimes by high-minded and candid men rejected as unworthy to be considered as Divine; though if it be admitted that God is the Artificer of the system of nature, wherein it would be accounted unreasonable to refuse to believe that which is

not understood; I know not why we should be called upon to deny that God is able to have a system of grace, if it so please Him; or why we may not believe that as the Artificer of that system He has conceived the scheme of Redemption to supply that which nature is incapable of bestowing, and which He was in no imaginable way bound to have made nature capable of bestowing.

Be this as it may, the scheme of Redemption, with all its essential parts, is proposed to us not as of nature, but as of grace; and thus as matter of faith, which though not evolvable by reason, is yet conformable to reason. The more conformable therefore any matter of faith — exactly stated and not explained away — is to reason, the more cogent is the constraint of our faith in regard to it. And the effort to exhibit the Eucharist as a reasonable service, and not an engine of superstition, cannot justly be disparaged except upon grounds equally applicable to the whole scheme of which it is so august a part.

With all good wishes,

Very truly yours,

Wm. J. Seabury.

ENGLISH [1]	AMERICAN [2]
Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again ;	All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that *thou*, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption ; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world ; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death and sacrifice, until his coming again:
[quasi-Invocation] Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood:	
Who in the same night that he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after Supper he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. *Amen.*	For in the night *in which* he was betrayed, *he* took Bread ; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body, which is given for you ; Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper, he took the Cup ; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this ; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins ; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

THE OBLATION

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make ; having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension ; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

THE INVOCATION

And *we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father,* to *hear us ; and*, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, *these thy* gifts and *creatures of bread and wine ;* that *we*, *receiving* them *according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.*

[1] Text from Sealed Book, 1662. [2] Text from Standard Edition, 1892.

ENGLISH[1]	AMERICAN[2]
[First Post-Communion Prayer.]	
O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy Fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion,	And we *earnestly* desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant that, by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we, and all thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and *living* sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that we, and all others who *shall be* partakers of this Holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, be *filled* with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him, that he may dwell in us, and we in him.
may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.	
And although we be unworthy through our manifold sins to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. *Amen.*	And although we *are* unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. *Amen.*

N.B. In the American columns, heavy face type marks additions; *heavy face italic* type marks alteration of words, or changed position of words and clauses.

RUBRIC FOR THE CONSECRATION OF ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS

English[1]	American[2]
If the consecrated bread or wine be all spent before all have communicated; the Priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed: beginning at [Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c.] *for the blessing of the bread; and at* [Likewise after Supper, &c.] *for the blessing of the cup.*	*If the consecrated Bread or Wine be spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more, according to the Form before prescribed; beginning at,* All glory be to thee, Almighty God, *and ending with these words,* partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.

[1] Text from Sealed Book, 1662.

[2] Text from Standard Edition, 1892.

The differences between these two editions of the Prayer of Consecration are evident upon the surface. The English Prayer of Consecration consists merely of a brief statement that God has redeemed the world through Christ's death, and that Christ has commanded His Church to observe the memorial of that sacrifice, followed by a very weak *quasi*-Invocation, which is, in turn, succeeded by the Narrative of the Institution and nothing else. It has not even the customary ending of a prayer, "through Jesus Christ our Lord," or the like. The American Prayer of Consecration, on the contrary, opens with an ascription of praise to God for the redemption made by Christ, and for the appointment by Christ of the Eucharistic memorial thereof. It omits the poor weak (English) *quasi*-Invocation, adding at once the Narrative of Institution as the explanation of the previous statement. After the Narrative follows *The Oblation* of the elements, and then *The Invocation* of the Father's blessing upon the elements just offered.[1] In these two parts the Scottish Office of 1764 was followed, with the exception of a slight change made in the wording of the latter half of *The Invocation*. The English prayer thus lays stress primarily upon the recital of the Narrative of Institution, while the American emphasizes the petition to God for consecration. This difference, too, is made plainer by the differentiation of the rubric for a second consecration of elements. The English specifically states a "form" of consecration for each element, *i.e.* the repetition of Christ's words "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," respectively; whereas the American rubric regards the *whole* prayer, from its beginning, to the end of *The Invocation* as the "form." This is a difference of

[1] The fourth (and concluding) paragraph of the American Prayer of Consecration is equivalent to the *first* English post-communion prayer, the petition for worthy reception being somewhat amplified in view of the changed position of the prayer. This is not included in the "form" of consecration, however, and therefore calls for no detailed examination.

no slight magnitude. The English Prayer of Consecration, taken in connection with its accompanying rubric for a second consecration, is the expression of the most extravagant "Western" view (so called) of Eucharistic consecration. The American Prayer of Consecration, on the other hand, taken in connection with its accompanying rubric for a second consecration, is the deliberate expression of the "Eastern" view as to the proper mode of consecrating Christ's Eucharistic memorial. In fact it is even more than that; it is the expression of the mind of undivided Christendom, and of the mind and practice of all the Oriental Churches, schismatical as well as Orthodox, down to the present time.

Until a comparatively recent period, moreover, it had always been understood that the Revisers of 1789 had made these "alterations and amendments" in the Prayer of Consecration with deliberate intent to bring it into accord with the whole of Eastern Christendom, and with the primitive and undivided Church, in its rationale of Eucharistic consecration. Within the lifetime of the present writer, however, the attempt has been made to engraft the modern Roman ceremonial of the *Canon Missae* upon the American Prayer of Consecration by insisting that the repetition of "This is My Body," etc., is the consecration, and that *The Invocation* is merely a prayer for the worthy reception of elements already consecrated. Nor only so, but even to allege that the slight change (from the Scottish) in the phraseology of *The Invocation*, as adopted in 1789, was made in order to render it meaningless, *i.e.* so far as its being a prayer for the consecration of the elements was concerned. The arguments with which this attempt has been supported bear a striking resemblance to those whereby Roman controversialists have endeavoured to subvert the plain meaning of the Epiklesis in the Eastern rites, and to introduce discord, if possible, into the Eastern Church. Yet so widely has the parallel perversion become current in the American Church, that it has seemed advisable to prepare

a handbook on the question of Eucharistic consecration, with the object of affording to those perplexed a means of guidance out of the labyrinth of sophistry and evasion in which the promulgators of the modern Roman theory of Eucharistic consecration would fain keep them immured, and to state results in so positive and non-controversial a fashion as to serve the interests of "truth, unity, and concord" in promoting loyalty to the plain meaning and grammatical construction of the Prayer of Consecration as revised in 1789.

The plan adopted therefore in this brief treatise has been to regard the American Prayer of Consecration as the full and final expression, in this particular, of the principles of the English Reformation. For the appeal to antiquity had been soberly and seriously made, and two centuries of careful study, by Anglican theologians, of the subject of Eucharistic consecration *inter alia* bore fruit in 1789. Taking then this, the latest development of the Prayer of Consecration in the Anglican Communion, as the point from which to view the question under consideration, we have (1) to examine the phraseology and construction of the American Prayer of Consecration, in order to determine its rationale; (2) to test this rationale by the data afforded us in the New Testament; (3) to inquire of the Fathers, and to look into the liturgical witness of the Undivided Church, and to see whether the early tradition has been maintained unbroken until to-day; (4) to see whether the so-called "Western" theory of Eucharistic consecration is really ancient, by an examination of the *Canon Missae*, and of the ceremonial that accompanied it in earlier and in later times; and (5) to trace the steps of the process of recovery of the ancient Catholic tradition, touching Eucharistic consecration, in the Anglican Communion, which culminated in the deliberate alteration and amendment of the poor, meagre, unsatisfactory English Prayer of Consecration into the present truly primitive and Catholic Eucharistic prayer by the Revisers of 1789.

The treatment of the subject is of necessity somewhat condensed; writers quoted have been left to speak for themselves, as a rule, without much comment, and the intricate sophistries of those who strive to pervert history and Liturgy have been left on one side, as of no value in comparison with the plain facts of history and of Catholic liturgical tradition. Simplicity and the positive exposition of truth have been the dominant aims, and in order to facilitate the use of this handbook by persons not acquainted with Latin and Greek, the original quotations have been placed in the Appendix.

In the course of the preparation of this treatise, the author has been indebted to many friends for helpful suggestions and criticisms, especially to the Rev. F. E. Brightman, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln, and Fellow of S. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford, and to the Rev. H. A. Wilson, M.A., Fellow and Librarian of the same college; to the Very Rev. W. M. Groton, D.D., Dean of the Philadelphia Divinity School, and to the Rev. L. M. Robinson, D.D., and the Rev. A. D. Heffern, D.D., of the Faculty of that school. To the Rev. R. B. Burke, M.A., Assistant Headmaster and Chaplain of the DeLancey School, I would express my most grateful thanks, not only for his kindness in reading and criticising the work in manuscript, but for his valuable assistance in reading the proof of the Appendix. The Rev. Horace A. Walton, B.D., Rector of Paoli, Pa., the Rev. Louis K. Lewis, M.A., Librarian of The Athenaeum of Philadelphia, and Mr. Lorin Blodget, Jr., have also rendered aid in the revising of proof sheets. To the Rev. H. E. Jacobs, D.D., Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mount Airy, I am indebted for the courtesy of free access to the excellent collection of German *Liturgica* of the sixteenth century in the Library of that school. To the Rev. Dr. Seabury I am under many obligations, not only for his kindness in writing an Introduction to this treatise, but for the loan of valuable books from his private library, for permission to print from his letter to the late Dr. Brand in the Appendix, for allow-

ing me to examine the manuscript correspondence and sermons of his great-grandfather, the Right Reverend Samuel Seabury, D.D., and for permission to copy extracts from the letter of the Rev. William Smith to Bishop Seabury quoted in Chapter V., pages 224–226. At the same time, no one is in any way responsible for the method and details of this handbook save the author himself.

It should be added that Chapters I., II., III., and V. were accepted by the Faculty of the Philadelphia Divinity School as a thesis preliminary to examination for the degree of Doctor of Divinity (in course) in the Epiphany Term of 1905. After some revision, and with the addition of Chapter IV. to complete the subject, they are here set forth in the hope that, in spite of their obvious limitations and many shortcomings, they may not only serve to deepen the appreciation of that most precious heritage of the American Church, her Prayer of Consecration of the Holy Eucharist, and to encourage a loyal adherence to its plain meaning and rationale, upon the part of those who are privileged to use it; but may also serve to remind those who are held in bondage to the far inferior English Prayer of Consecration, of the significance and value of the chief alteration and amendment of the Book of Common Prayer made by the Revisers of 1789, as expressing the sober and ripened thought of the Anglican Reformation, as carrying out into practice its appeal to Catholic antiquity, and thus constituting an important step toward the reunion of Christendom, around the Sacrament of Christ's love, as observed from of old in His Church.

The Rectory, Haddonfield, New Jersey,
Feast of the Transfiguration, 6 August, 1907.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION BY THE REV. WILLIAM JONES SEABURY, D.D. . vii

AUTHOR'S PREFACE xxiii

CHAPTER I

THE TEXT AND PHRASEOLOGY OF THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION 1

Title in Rubric preceding — Suggested by Laud — First appears in Book of 1637 — An Appropriate Title — Opening Ascription of Praise — Misplacement of Prayer of Humble Access — Emphasis laid upon Christ's Death — Need for this — Narrative of Institution quoted — Source of this — Narrative embellished by Mimetic Gestures — Their Significance, especially the Last — *The Oblation* — Text — Scope — Significance — *The Invocation* — Closely related to *The Oblation* — Text — Plain Meaning — Summary — Rationale of Eucharistic Consecration, according to the Prayer of Consecration and the Rubric for a Second Consecration of Elements.

CHAPTER II

THE RATIONALE OF EUCHARISTIC CONSECRATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT 19

The Four N.T. Narratives — Text of S. Luke xxii. 14–20 — Distinction between Last Passover and First Eucharist — Comparison of the Four N.T. Accounts — Uniformity in their Sequence — Significance of this Uniformity — Christ consecrated by His Act of Blessing — Εὐχαριστεῖν and Εὐλογεῖν — "The Cup of Blessing," 1 Cor. x. 16 — 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 17 — Romans xv. 16 — 1 Timothy iv. 4, 5 — Christ's Pattern of Eucharistic Consecration followed by His Church.

CHAPTER III

PAGE

THE PATRISTIC WITNESS AND THE LITURGICAL TRADITION OF THE UNDIVIDED CHURCH 34

Unanimity and Continuity of Patristic and Liturgical Witness — S. Justin Martyr — S. Irenæus — Tertullian — Origen — S. Cyprian — Firmilian of Cæsarea — Dionysius of Alexandria — S. Athanasius — *Ethiopic Church Ordinances* — Sacramentary of Serapion — Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions, Book VIII. — S. Cyril of Jerusalem — Importance of his Witness — S. Basil of Cæsarea — S. Ambrose — Discussion of his Testimony — Pseudo-Ambrose — S. Chrysostom — Discussion of his Opinions — Ephraem Syrus — Peter II. of Alexandria — Gregory of Nyssa — Theophilus of Alexandria — Nilus — S. Augustine — Jerome — The Greek Jerome — Isidore of Pelusium — S. Cyril of Alexandria — Proclus — Gaudentius of Brescia — Theodoret of Cyrus — Liturgy of S. James — Nestorian Liturgy of Addai and Mari — Abyssinian Anaphora of our Lord — Gelasius I. — Fulgentius of Ruspe — Cæsarius of Arles — Fragment of Gallican Liturgy — Gregory the Great — Eusebius of Alexandria — Eutychius of Constantinople — Anastasius Sinaita — John Moschus — S. Isidore of Seville — James of Edessa — Venerable Bede — John Damascene — Council of Constantinople, 754 — Second Council of Nicæa, 787 — Liturgies of SS. Chrysostom and Basil — Chosroes the Great — Samonas of Gaza — Theophylact — Dionysius bar Salibi — Germanus of Constantinople — Theodore of Andida — *Reply* of Manuel — Nicholas Cabasilas of Thessalonica — Armenian Liturgy first faulted by the Roman Church — Symeon of Thessalonica — Council of Florence, 1439 — Isidore of Kieff — Syropulus — Mark of Ephesus — Gabriel of Philadelphia — Orthodox Confession — Synod of Jerusalem — Declaration to the Marquis de Nointel — Oath of a Russian Bishop — Eustratius Argentes — Longer Catechism of Russian Church — Euchologion of Greek Church — Modern Commentary on the Liturgy — *Holy Catechism* of Bernardakis — Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople to the Papal Encyclical on Union.

CHAPTER IV

PAGE

THE WITNESS OF THE ROMAN *CANON MISSAE* 115

Statement of the Question — Roman Dominance in the West — S. Isidore of Seville — Ancient Gallican Rite — Prayers *Post Secreta* and *Post Mysterium* — Mozarabic Rite — Missal as edited by Ximenes — Witness of the Prayers *Post Pridie* — *Liber Ordinum* — Agreement with the East — Roman *Canon Missae* — Translation — Analysis — *Supplices te*, the Roman Invocation proper — Mgr. Duchesne's Comment on *Supplices te* — Summary — Rome originally at one with the East — Alcuin — Caroline Books — Theodulph of Orleans — Agobard of Lyons — Nicholas I. — Rabanus Maurus — *Ordo Romanus I.* — *Ordo Romanus II.* — Amalarius — Synod of Quierci — S. Blaise Sacramentary — Summary — Dr. Hoppe quoted — Beginnings of Scholastic theory of Eucharistic Consecration — Paschasius Radbertus — Florus — Synod of Arras — Council at Rome — Oath of Berengar — Eusebius Bruno — Guitmund of Aversa — Durandus of Troarn — Berengar's own Witness — Exaggeration of Picking up of Bread and Cup — Remnants of Earlier Belief — Alger of Liège — Peter Lombard — Durandus — Summary — New Doctrine of Consecration — Bruno of Segni — Odo of Cambray — Honorius of Autun — Further Development of Lifting up the Elements — Hildebert of Tours — Stephen of Autun — Hugo of S. Victor — Differentiation of Picking up Elements and Elevation — Statutes of the Carthusians — Spread of the New Ceremonial — Synod of Paris — Richard Poore, Bishop of Salisbury — Stephen Langton — Synod of Worcester — Synod of Exeter — Development of the Celebrant's Ceremonial — *Ordo Romanus XIV.* — Further Developments — John Burckard's *Ordo Missae* — Stereotyped in the Missal of Pius V. for the Roman Church after the Reformation — This distinctively Modern Roman Ceremonial unlawful in English and American Churches.

CHAPTER V

THE RESTORATION OF THE EPIKLESIS IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION, 1549–1789 175

Invocation in the First Book of Edward VI. — Weakened Form in the Second Book, 1552 — Carlstadt — Luther —

PAGE

Verba Testamenti — Cranmer's Imitation of German Models — Conservative German *Kirchen-Ordnungen* — Kaspar Kantz's Evangelical Mass — Pfalz-Neuberg K.O. of 1543 — Influence of the *Antididagma* upon Cranmer — Value of the weak Invocation retained in 1552 — Growing Appreciation of Early Tradition in regard to Eucharistic Consecration — Bishop Andrewes — Crakanthorp — Bishop Morton — Hayward — Bishop Cosin — His Suggestion for improving the weak English Invocation — Bishop Forbes — Archbishop Bramhall — Bishop Jeremy Taylor — Herbert Thorndike — Bishop Wilson — L'Estrange — Dr. John Ernest Grabe — Bingham — Wheatly — B.C.P. for Scotland 1637 — Draft of Liturgy c. 1619–1629 — Westminster Directory — Nonjuring School of Theologians — John Johnson — Bishop Hickes — Nonjurors' Liturgy — Bishop Thomas Brett — Bishop Deacon's Liturgy and Catechisms — Bishop Rattray's Liturgy — Bishop Archibald Campbell — Bishop Robert Forbes's Catechism — Bishop Seabury — Concordate with the Scottish Bishops — Rev. William Smith's Letter to Bishop Seabury — Bishop Seabury's Second Charge to his Clergy, and his Communion Office — Writes to Bishop White — General Convention adopts American Prayer of Consecration — Identity of Meaning of the Scottish and American Phraseology of *The Invocation* — Dr. William Smith supported Bishop Seabury in the General Convention of 1789 — Proposed Amendment of the English Invocation adopted by the Maryland and Pennsylvania State Conventions of 1786 — Bishop Seabury knew of, and appealed to, their Action — Bishop Seabury's published Sermon "Of the Holy Eucharist" — *An Introduction*, etc., 1805 — Summary and Conclusion.

APPENDIX

CONTAINING THE ORIGINAL LATIN AND GREEK TEXTS, AND OTHER ORIGINAL MATTER, REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS 245

BIBLIOGRAPHY 437

INDEX 451

THE CONSECRATION OF THE EUCHARIST

CHAPTER I

TEXT AND PHRASEOLOGY OF THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION

The title and purpose of the prayer which is the subject of this essay is given in the last clause of the rubric preceding: "*When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the People, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say the* Prayer of Consecration, *as followeth.*" [1] That its name and purport are so clearly stated in this place is due primarily to that great defender of the Church of England, Archbishop Laud. Writing to the Right Reverend James Wedderburne, under date of April 20, 1636, in reference to the final preparations for the ill-fated Book of Common Prayer for Scotland, he says: "Fifthly, I would have every prayer or other action through the whole Communion named in the rubric before it, that it may be known to the people what it is, as I have begun to do in the Prayer of Consecration, and in the Memorial, or Prayer of Oblation. *Fac similiter.*" [2] This was a definite advance upon the earlier Books of 1549 and 1552, and upon the English Book then in use. In the First Book of Edward VI. there is found, after the salutation, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church," a rubric that reads: "*Then the Priest, turning him to the Altar, shall say or sing, plainly and distinctly, this Prayer following.*" Under this caption was included apparently not only the prayer for

[1] Page 235, American Standard Book of Common Prayer, 1892.
[2] Laud's *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. VI., p. 457.

the Whole State of Christ's Church, but also the Invocation and the Narrative of Institution, as they followed without any further rubrical heading. Between the Narrative of Institution and the Prayer of Oblation following, was inserted a rubric referring to the Narrative alone; *i.e.*, "*These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation, or shewing the Sacrament to the people.*" In the Second Book of Edward VI., in the Book of 1559, and in the subsequent editions until the Book of 1662, the rubric standing before the shortened Prayer of Consecration, read simply: "*Then the Priest standing up, shall say as followeth.*" In the Scottish Book of 1637, however, in accordance with Archbishop Laud's suggestion to Bishop Wedderburne, the rubric before the Invocation (and the Narrative of Institution, which followed this immediately) read thus: "*Then the Presbyter standing up, shall say the prayer of consecration, as followeth. . . .*" In the Book of 1662 the rubric reads as quoted at the opening of this chapter, save that the words "Prayer of Consecration" were not then marked out by Roman type as they are now in the American Standard Book of Common Prayer of 1892. In other words, we may reasonably infer that the prayer following this rubric is called the Prayer of Consecration because its chief characteristic is an act of prayer to God the Father, asking Him to bless the offered elements of bread and wine, so that they may be the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The text of the Prayer of Consecration next demands our attention, in order that we may the more readily comprehend its rationale and understand more clearly the relation of its parts one to the other. It opens with a brief ascription of praise, "All glory be to thee, Almighty God," derived through Bishop Seabury's Communion Office of 1786, from the Scottish Communion Office of 1764. These words link the Prayer of Consecration closely

to the *Sanctus*. In fact, they correspond to and epitomize the *Post Sanctus* of the Gallican (and Eastern) Liturgies, which is to be found at length in the Communion Office of the Nonjurors of 1718 [1] and in Bishop Rattray's "Office for the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist," etc., of 1744 [2] (from the Greek Liturgy of St. James). The prayer of humble access is misplaced in the American Liturgy, a dislocation taken over from the English Book, as properly it should precede immediately the actual reception of the Holy Communion. The continuity of the Prayer of Consecration with the first part of the Anaphora, or Canon, would then be seen more clearly, as the note of praise and thanksgiving is caught up, and reëchoed in view of the redemptive sacrifice of the cross. For we must recall that the *Canon Missae*, like the Greek Anaphora, was more anciently understood to begin with the *Sursum Corda*, and thus to include the great act of thanksgiving for creation and for redemption, of which the *Sanctus* was the centre. Thus the Gelasian Sacramentary, the *Missale Francorum*, the Sacramentary of Gellona, and the Leofric Missal, place the title, "*Incipit Canon Actionis*," before the *Sursum Corda;* whereas *Ordo Romanus I.* puts the beginning of the Canon, as now, after the *Sanctus*, and before the prayer *Te igitur*.[3]

"All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption." The note of praise is taken up in honour of the redemptive sacrifice of the cross; which is first described as the act of God the Father, and then immediately restated (in a relative clause) as the act of God the

[1] See Appendix, p. 424. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 428.

[3] Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte . . . des Missale Romanum*, etc., p. 395, note 3. Cf. *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, article ANAPHORE, by Dom Cabrol, col. 1898 *seq.*

Son; "who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world." This statement first makes its appearance in the Book of 1549, with the exception of the words "of himself" in the parenthesis, "by his one oblation of himself once offered," which were introduced in the Book of 1552. The moment of the cross is strongly emphasized, evidently with a view to preclude any notion of a repetition of the same. The theologians of the later Middle Ages had come to regard the sacrifice of Christ as exclusively expressed by His death upon the cross, and at the same time, popular opinion had asserted not only an independent propitiatory value for the Eucharistic sacrifice, but also a remactation of Christ therein.[1] The clause under consideration would seem to have been framed to meet this error, widely current in Cranmer's day. It must therefore be interpreted in its positive aspect only, as it would be most unreasonable to argue negatively therefrom against that primitive and truly Catholic teaching which sets the Eucharist, in its sacrificial aspect, in line with and over against the background of Christ's exercise of His eternal Melchizedek High-priesthood in the heavens.[2] Moreover, the *raison d'être* of the opening ascription of praise is not complete, until, in another relative clause, parallel to the last, is stated the fact that Christ instituted the Eucharistic memorial of His death: "and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death and sacrifice, until his coming again." Then follows in illustration and proof of this statement, the Narrative of the original Institution, introduced by the causal conjunction "For." This narrative is virtually a quotation, following chiefly the Pauline account (1 Cor. xi., 23–25), but combining

[1] Cf. Kidd, *The Later Mediaeval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, pp. 24 *seq.*

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 105–113.

also details from the two accounts in the first and third gospels respectively (Matt. xxvi. 26–28; Luke xxii. 19, 20). It cannot be too thoroughly understood, that this is purely an historical narrative, contained in a secondary clause, and that the plain laws of language do not permit anything else to be made of it. We are given simply a description of that original institution of the Eucharist, which is one of the two reasons assigned for the opening ascription of praise.[1]

"For in the night in which he was betrayed, he took Bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body, which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper, he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me." This narrative lacks the fuller detail of the older Liturgies, conforming more closely to the Scriptural accounts, and is noteworthy chiefly in two points. It contains the clause, "as oft as ye shall drink it," which is not found in the older Liturgies; and it omits the words "he blessed it" after the words "and when he had given thanks." In the Book of 1549 this last phrase was used of Christ's action regarding the bread, but it was dropped even thence in the Book of 1552. The exact arrangement or combination of the four New Testament narratives was probably taken by Cranmer from the formula in the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Kirchen-Ordnung of 1533.[2] The

[1] Cf. Chap. V., pp. 222–241, for the significance of the paragraph under consideration, in the eyes of those who brought about the adoption of our present American Prayer of Consecration.

[2] See Jacobs, *The Lutheran Movement in England*, pp. 45–48; and Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 206–207, note 1, and Appendix, VI., pp. 444–448.

TABLE I

THE NARRATIVE

When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the People, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration,[1] *as followeth.*

All glory be to thee,[2] Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou,[3] of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one [4] oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death and sacrifice,[5] until his coming again: For in the night in which he was betrayed, (*a*) he took Bread; and when he had [6] given thanks, (*b*) he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, (*c*) this is my Body, which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper, (*d*) he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for (*e*) this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

(a) *Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands.*[7]

(b) *And here to break the Bread.*[8]

(c) *And here to lay his hand upon all the Bread.*[9]

(d) *Here he is to take the Cup into his hands.*[10]

(e) *And here he is to lay his hand upon every vessel* [11] *in which there is any Wine* [12] *to be consecrated.*

1549

[7] Here the Priest must take the bread into his hands.

[10] Here the Priest shall take the cup into his hands.

1637 Sc.

[7] At these words (*took bread*) the Presbyter that officiates is to take the Paten in his hand.

[10] At these words (*took the cup*) he is to take the chalice in his hand,

[11] and lay his hand upon so much, be it in chalice or flagons, as he intends to consecrate.

[1] The title "Prayer of Consecration" first appears in 1637 Sc.

[2] "All glory be to thee," 1786 Sea. from 1764 Sc.

[3] "for that thou," required by the introduction of "All glory be to

more than close parallel between them, taken in connection with Cranmer's visits to Nürnberg in 1532, during which year this particular Kirchen-Ordnung was prepared, and the fact that Cranmer met and married the niece of Osiander, one of the two collaborators thereof, would seem to be decisive.

We next observe that the recital of this narrative is accompanied and embellished by five mimetic gestures,[1] which serve to constitute it a solemn rehearsal before God the Father, of Christ's acts and words at His institution of the Eucharist. In the Book of 1549 we find the elaborate rubrics of the Sarum (and other English Uses) swept away. Two brief directions only: "Here the Priest must take the bread into his hands;" and "Here the Priest shall take the cup into his hands;" are to be found in the margin of the Narrative of Institution, and the Narrative is followed by the direction: "These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation, or shewing the Sacrament to the people." All such directions are absent from the Book

[1] See Table I.

---

thee," first in 1764 Sc. ("which" 1549, 1552, 1637 Sc., "who" 1662).

[4] "one," the constant reading from 1549 on, except 1764 Sc. "own."

[5] "and sacrifice," first appears in 1637 Sc.

[6] "blessed, and" are inserted between "had" and "given" in 1549, but omitted in all since, 1718 Nj. included.

[8] This rubric first appears in 1662.

[9] "hands," 1764 Sc., 1786 Sea.; "hand" 1662, 1718 Nj.

[10] "hand," 1662 Sealed Books, 1764 Sc., 1786 Sea.; "hands" 1662 MS., 1718 Nj.

[11] Bp. Rattray 1744 and 1786 Proposed Book omitted "be it Chalice or Flagon."

[12] 1718 Nj. adds "and water."

Note that the Nonjurors' Liturgy of 1718 has also directions for the Priest to lay his hand upon the bread, and upon any vessel in which there is wine and water, during *The Invocation.* See Appendix, page 426; and cf. also Bishop Rattray's Liturgy of 1744, page 430, which has the same directions.

of 1552, and none reappear till the Book of 1662.[1] The Scottish Book of 1637, however, had reintroduced the two marginal rubrics of 1549 with slight verbal differences, and had added a direction to lay the hand upon any vessel containing wine to be consecrated. In the Book of 1662 these are inserted together with the addition of a direction for the priest to break the bread, and also to lay his hand upon it. The last marginal rubric in our American Book is the only one that calls for particular notice at present: "And here he is to lay his hand upon every vessel in which there is any Wine to be consecrated." In view of the rubrical title, "Prayer of Consecration," and of the rubric that governs a second consecration, and, above all, of the fact that no prayer for God to consecrate the elements will be made until *The Invocation*, it is evident that "to be consecrated" refers to the (as yet) future hallowing of the bread and wine by God in response to our prayer to that end in *The Invocation*.[2]

These gestures in the Narrative of Institution have no other original significance than as mimetic or illustrative, in any Liturgy. Even the gestures now practised during the recital of the Narrative "Qui pridie" in the Roman *Canon Missae* are, in their ultimate analysis, no real exception to this statement, as they have grown to their present complexity and altered character as the result

[1] That they were in common use, however, appears, *e.g.*, from Archbishop Laud's letter, to which reference has been made. *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. VI., p. 458. Cf. Bishop Cosin's Notes, *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. V., p. 340.

[2] It is also to be remembered that this rubric is found in the Nonjurors' Liturgy of 1718, in Bishop Rattray's of 1744, in the Scottish Book of 1764, and in Bishop Seabury's Communion Office of 1786. It is absolutely certain therefore that its phrase "to be consecrated" cannot possibly be fairly pressed into the service of the theory which strives to force the Roman notion of consecration upon our American Prayer of Consecration. If this phrase had been supposed to negative the amendments made in 1789, it would have been altered, as was the rubric for a second consecration of elements.

of exaggeration, and of a gradual misunderstanding of their significance, that arose in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and reached its full development in the sixteenth century, only. Of this development we shall treat later.[1]

Thus the first paragraph of our Prayer of Consecration is seen to be a giving of thanks and praise to God the Father for the death of His Son upon the cross, considered as the loving act both of the Father and of the Son; and for the commemorative sacrifice instituted by Christ, whose acts, (1) "thanksgiving," "blessing"; statements (2), "This is my Body," etc.; and commands (3), "Take, eat," "Drink ye all," etc., "Do this," etc., we solemnly rehearse as a preamble to our complete observance of the requirements of that our Charter, Warrant, and Commission, as once for all originally spoken by Him. Part of His command we have already obeyed in the Preface and *Sanctus*, *i.e.* thanksgiving; and now having read over our Charter, the commemorative sacrifice is forthwith to be made, *i.e.* the elements are to be offered in Christ's memorial; and after that again, they are to be hallowed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God.

The second paragraph of the Prayer of Consecration therefore next claims our attention. It marks a return to present time, *i.e.* an act now made by us before God; and in it not only do we declare our obedience to Christ's command ("Do this," etc.), which command we have just rehearsed, but we actually carry out and accomplish that obedience to that one special definite command.

"Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ." We declare that we are acting in accordance with that original institution, just recited, and then at once we go on to make the Christ-ordained memorial before God the Father, by means of the antitypical bread

[1] See Chap. IV., pp. 146–174. Cf. Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, second edition, London, 1876, pp. 602–607; 616–620.

and wine (now regarded as "holy," *i.e.* as already set apart and placed upon the Holy Table at the Offertory for this high use), the memorial of the work and sacrifice of His Incarnate Son: "we, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make." The text[1] of this part of the Prayer of Consecration is taken from Bishop Seabury's Communion Office of 1786 and the Scottish Communion Office of 1764; which derived it from the Book of 1637 for Scotland (and this equals, almost *verbatim*, that in the Book of 1549), with the addition of the phrase "which we now offer unto thee," after the words, "these thy holy gifts;" and with the change of "willed" into "commanded." The addition of the words, "which we now offer unto thee,"[2] brings out and emphasizes the actual present accomplishment of our obedience and the objective character thereof. For the idea of a memorial, in its completeness, involves four things: —

(1) The person (or persons) making (or causing to be made) the memorial.

(2) The person (or thing) intended to be remembered.

(3) The person (or persons) memorialized, *i.e.* the one (or ones) whom it is desired to provoke to a memory of (2).

(4) The means (or thing) employed by (1) to recall (2) to the mind of (3).

All these are found clearly marked in this act of ours as expressed in this (second) paragraph of the Prayer of Consecration. Christ gave command to do (ποιεῖν) His memorial. It involves of necessity: —

(1) Those who make the memorial, *i.e.* the Christian Church, through and with its representative priesthood.

[1] See Table II on opposite page.

[2] *Ibid.*, col. 2, note 2. These words were printed in small capitals in the editions of the B.C.P. of 1790 and 1791, after the manner of Bishop Seabury's Communion Office of 1786, and the Scottish Office of 1764. This was given up in all subsequent editions.

(2) The Person to be called to mind, Christ.

(3) The Person memorialized, God the Father, who is besought to look upon the offering of His dear Son.

(4) The means employed by us (1) to call Christ's (2) work to His Father's (3) mind; *i.e.* the bread and wine offered in this, *The Oblation.*

This paragraph then closes with the expression of the subjective aspect of the offering, *i.e.* the frame of mind

TABLE II

THE OBLATION

1	2
Text of 1549 with variants of 1637 Sc.[1]	Text of 1786 Sea. with variants of 1789–1892[1] American.
Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly father, according to the Institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesu[2] Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks, for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.	Wherefore, O Lord, and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine majesty, with these thy holy gifts, [2] WHICH WE NOW OFFER UNTO THEE,[2] the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion, [3] and precious death,[3] his mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

[1] 1637 Sc. Title in rubric preceding, "this memorial or prayer of oblation."

[2] 1637 Sc. "Jesus."

[1] Title indented in 1764 Sc., 1786 Sea., and in Amer. 1789–1892, *The Oblation.*

[2–2] From 1735 edition of 1637 Sc. Capitals not used in Amer. B. C. P. since first editions of 1790 and 1791, and reimpressions of the same.

[3–3] First added in 1764 Sc.

of those engaged in the solemn ordained memorial; declaring not only our due recollection of all that the Lord Christ has done for us, by His death, His resurrection and His ascension, but also our gratitude for the good that has accrued to us therefrom: "having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same." We should note in passing that the position of this clause, standing as it does in our Liturgy, at the end of this paragraph, while in the older Liturgies it comes at the beginning, is without any particular significance. Cranmer transposed it in 1549 apparently in order to conform more closely to the genius of the English language. We should also note more particularly, that this paragraph being in substance derived from the older Latin (*Unde et memores*), takes within its scope not merely Christ's death, but also His triumph and His glorification. In this respect *The Oblation* conforms to the earlier (and Scriptural) notion of Christ's work of redemption, and does not bear the marks of the controversies of the sixteenth century, as do the opening clauses of the first paragraph of our Prayer of Consecration, which emphasize solely the fact of Christ's death. The title of this paragraph, we also note, is indented into it: *The Oblation.* This is taken from Bishop Seabury's Communion Office of 1786 (from the Scottish Office of 1764), and marks very clearly the significance of this (second) paragraph of the Prayer of Consecration. This act is THE OBLATION *par excellence* of the bread and wine. There is a preliminary oblation in the setting of the elements upon the credence table, so that they may be ready for use in the Liturgy. There is again the presentation of (a part at least of) this bread and wine at the Offertory to be used in the memorial sacrifice. And finally there is the actual memorial itself made with the antitypes of bread and wine, in this *The Oblation.* The

essential element on man's part, in all sacrifice (*sacrum* + *facere*) [1] is dedication, and this is fulfilled as our act in *The Oblation.*

Next follows the third paragraph of our Prayer of Consecration, designated by its own indented title, *The Invocation.* It is closely connected with *The Oblation* as its corollary and complement. The early Church regarded the consecration as the act of God in answer to the prayer of the Church for that end. We Christians do our part, *i.e.* we make Christ's solemn memorial offering with the symbols of bread and wine. Forthwith we pray (in *The Invocation*) God to do His part, and He accepts our material oblation, and glorifies and hallows it to be the Body and Blood of His dear Son. So close indeed is the relation of these two acts (*i.e.* of oblation and invocation), that Mr. Brightman, in his *Liturgies Eastern and Western,* vol. i.,[2] puts the two under the one title of "The Invocation." For our offering is a virtual, and our petition for consecration the actual, invocation of God's blessing upon the bread and wine.

The Invocation opens with lowly request to be heard of God in respect of our petition that we are about to make, "And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us." This expression of humility (accompanied by a profound bow, or inclination) is, as we shall see, the characteristic opening of the Epiklesis in all Liturgies. We then proceed (basing our request upon His goodness and mercy) to ask God the Father to hallow the elements of bread and wine (that have just now been offered to Him in the Oblation), through the instrumentality of the Second and Third Persons of the Most Holy Trinity, so that it will be possible through the reception of the out-

[1] Cf. the definition of "sacrifice" given by S. Isidore of Seville. See p. 80 below, and for the Latin, Appendix, p. 283.

[2] *E.g.* pp. 20, 52, 87, 133, 178, 190, 233, 287, 328, 386, and 437.

ward "signs" to receive "verily and indeed," because "spiritually," the Body and Blood of Christ: "and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood." We should note that the text [1] of the Invocation is taken from Bishop Seabury's Communion Office of 1786, with a difference in the concluding half only. The Book of 1637 for Scotland had added to the form of 1549 the final clauses of the weak Epiklesis of 1552.[2] This somewhat clumsy formula was shortened in one way by the Scottish Book of 1764 (followed by Bishop Seabury),[3] and in another way by the American revisers of 1789;[4] who followed very closely, whether wittingly or not cannot now be said, a form submitted (in Sancroft's handwriting) to a Committee of Convocation in the course of the revision of 1661–1662.[5] We should also note the obvious force and meaning of the phraseology employed in our American form of the Invocation. God the Father is plainly asked to "bless and sanctify" His own "gifts and creatures of bread and wine" to what end? "That," *i.e.* to the purpose and end that, "we, receiving them," *i.e.* the elements that have been consecrated by Him, may be *ipso facto* partakers of Christ's "most blessed Body and Blood." [6]

[1] See Table III., 7. [2] See Table III., 3.

[3] See Table III., 5.

[4] Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, second edition, London, 1876, p. 588, comparing the American form of *The Invocation* with that of the Book of 1637, says: "The American resembles the Scotch, but omits the words 'that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son'; which are indeed unnecessary, as the same thing is expressed in the next clause which it retains; viz. 'that we receiving them,' etc."

[5] See Table III., 4. [6] See Chap. V., pp. 231–233.

1
1549

Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech thee: and with thy holy spirit and word, vouchsafe to bl✠ess and sanc✠tify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.

2
1552

Hear us, O merciful father, we beseech thee,

and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.

3
1637 Sc.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son; so that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of the same his most precious body and blood.

4
1661 Sancroft

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and

by the Power of thy holy Word and Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy Gifts and Creatures of Bread and Wine;

that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy Institution, in Remembrance of him, and to shew forth his Death and Passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood

5
1764 Sc., 1786 Sea.

And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.

6
1786 Md. and Pa.

Hear us O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify
these thy creatures of bread and wine,

that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.

7
1789–1892 American

And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine;

that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.

No sophistry can make this out to be a mere prayer for the worthy reception of elements supposed to be already consecrated by the reading of the Narrative of Institution. *The Invocation* in our American Book of Common Prayer is unmistakable in its meaning. It is an heritage of which to be proud, incapable of being explained away in the interests of Romanensian teaching in our Church. Moreover we should note, that these paragraphs which we have had under consideration (the Narrative, the Oblation, and the Invocation) make up the "Form" of consecration in accordance with the rubric governing a second consecration [1] of more bread and wine, if the species first consecrated do not suffice for all the communicants. "If the consecrated Bread or Wine be spent before all have com-

[1] See p. 237, American Standard Book of Common Prayer, 1892. Cf. the various provisions in Table IV.

Note also that while on the one hand the Order of Communion (1548) followed the customary late mediæval notion of consecration, and that this same notion was embodied in the canon of 1603, in the rubric in the Book of 1637 for Scotland, and in the present English Book of Common Prayer of 1662, yet on the other hand, the rubric in the Scottish Communion Office of 1764 (followed *verbatim* by Bishop Seabury's Communion Office of 1786) and in the American Book, 1789–1892, marks an unmistakable return to primitive tradition in this matter.

Cf. also the third rubric after the Gospel in the Order for the Communion of the Sick (added in 1892), which provides: "In the times of contagious sickness or disease, or when extreme weakness renders it expedient, the following form shall suffice: The Confession and the Absolution; *Lift up your hearts*, etc., through the *Sanctus;* The Prayer of Consecration, ending with these words, *partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood;* the Communion; the Lord's Prayer; The Blessing." Page 293, American Standard B. C. P., 1892. The same unalterable minimum is here required as in the rubric for a second consecration. The mind of the American Church was the same in 1892 as in 1789.

It is obvious that the fourth paragraph of the Prayer of Consecration, following *The Invocation*, being non-essential to the integrity of the act of consecration, does not come within the scope of this essay.

TABLE IV

REGULATIONS OR RUBRICS GOVERNING A SECOND CONSECRATION

1

1548. The Order of the Communion

NOTE. That if it doth so chance that the Wine hallowed and consecrated doth not suffice or be enough for them that do take the Communion, the Priest, after the first Cup or Chalice be emptied, may go again to the Altar, and reverently and devoutly prepare and consecrate another, and so the third, or more likewise, beginning at these words, *Simili modo postquam cœnatum est*, and ending at these words, *Qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*, and without any levation or lifting up.

2

Canon xxi, 1603

. . . Furthermore, no Bread or Wine newly brought, shall be used, but first the words of Institution shall be rehearsed, when the said Bread and Wine be present upon the Communion-Table.

3

1637 Sc.

And to the end there may be little left, he that officiates is required to consecrate with the least, and then if there be want, the words of consecration may be repeated again, over more, either bread or wine: the Presbyter beginning at these words in the prayer of consecration (*Our Saviour in the night that he was betrayed, took, &c.*).

4

1662

If the consecrated Bread or Wine be all spent before all have communicated; the Priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed: Beginning at [*Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c.*] for the blessing of the Bread; and at [*Likewise after Supper &c.*] for the blessing of the Cup.

5

1764 Sc., 1786 Sea.

If the consecrated bread or wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Presbyter[1] is to consecrate more, according to the form before prescribed, beginning at the words, *All glory be to thee,* &c. and ending with the words *that they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.*

[1] Priest, 1786 Sea.

6

1789–1892 American

If the consecrated Bread or Wine be spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more, according to the Form before prescribed; beginning at, *All glory be to thee, Almighty God,* and ending with these words, *partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.*

municated, the Priest is to consecrate more, according to the Form before prescribed; beginning at, *All glory be to thee, Almighty God,* and ending with these words, *partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.*" The word "form" is, of course, not used in the restrictive sense common in mediæval and modern Latin theology, but as embracing the minimum required by an exact obedience to Christ's command. In other words, the consecration of the Holy Eucharist is not regarded by the American Church as accomplished by the mere recital of the Narrative of the original Institution, but after that has been rehearsed as containing the warrant for our observance of the rite, solemn memorial to God is made of Christ our Sacrifice, with the material elements ordained by Him, and then, the Divine Mercy is invoked to make, through the operation of the Word and the Holy Spirit, these "gifts and creatures of bread and wine," to be the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. In other words this consecration is the act of God in response to our prayer therefor, and *The Invocation* is the consummation and crown of our solemn act of obedience to Christ's command—*The* PRAYER OF CONSECRATION *par excellence.*[1]

[1] Cf. *Tracts for the Times,* Tract 63, [by R. H. Froude] *The Antiquity of the Existing Liturgies,* p. 7. "It appears from Mr. Palmer's valuable work, that all the ancient Liturgies now existing, or which can be proved ever to have existed, resemble one another in the following points:— . . . (6) Also a commemoration of our Lord's words and actions in the institution of the Eucharist, which is the same, almost word for word, in every Liturgy, but is not taken from any of the four Scripture accounts. (7) A sacrificial oblation of the Eucharistic bread and wine. (8) A prayer of consecration, that God will 'make the bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ.'"

N.B. (1) The title "prayer of consecration" is given specifically to the Invocation. (2) In the parallel tables the Invocation is called "Consecration prayer" (once simply "Consecration"). (3) The Narrative of Institution is invariably called "Commemoration of our Lord's words."

CHAPTER II

THE RATIONALE OF EUCHARISTIC CONSECRATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

We must now examine the New Testament writings, and ascertain what rationale of Eucharistic consecration is outlined therein, in order that we may obtain a criterion, original, Apostolic, inspired, whereby to test that rationale of Eucharistic observance to which our American Church stands pledged, liturgically, historically, and grammatically, in the Prayer of Consecration in her Communion Office.

It is obvious that our attention must be directed primarily to the four separate narratives which describe the Lord Christ's original institution of the Eucharist; and afterward to such other hints or suggestions as may be afforded elsewhere in the New Testament.

Before we begin our examination of these narratives, however, we are obliged to look into the text of the passages under consideration. Fortunately, the text of three of these accounts cannot be called into question in any large degree. The narratives of S. Mark (xiv. 22–25), of S. Matthew (xxvi. 26–29), and of S. Paul (1. Cor. xi. 23–26), after undergoing most careful textual scrutiny, have not been deemed by scholars to need much correction from the commonly received text, save in the dropping of a word or two from each, that may easily have crept in through the influence of the details of each account upon the mind of the copyist, disposing him, all unconsciously, to assimilate one to the other. But in the case of S. Luke's account,

inasmuch as Westcott and Hort saw fit to enclose in double brackets part of verse 19 and the whole of verse 20, and vigorously to attack their genuineness,[1] and as the opinion of these distinguished scholars has influenced many during the last twenty years, it seems necessary to state briefly why their conclusions have not been accepted by the writer of this handbook. In the first place, the burden of proof must rest upon those who, like Westcott and Hort, would impugn the genuineness of this verse and a half, in view of the overwhelming evidence in their favour.[2] In the second place the omission of 19*b*, 20 is

[1] In the Appendix to the Introduction to their text of the New Testament, pp. 63–64, New York, 1882.

[2] All the known Greek MSS. (except the bi-lingual D), all the Versions (except those mentioned hereafter), the Old Latin MSS. c f q; the Vulgate; Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, IV. 40; the *Canons* of Eusebius; the *Ethics* ascribed to Basil; and Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary* on S. Luke; — all this goodly army of witnesses read the text of S. Luke (xxii. 14–20), as given in column three of Table V., pp. 22–23.

Verses 19*b*, 20 are omitted by one Greek MS. only, D; and by the Old Latin d, a, ff^2, i, l; b and e omit and also transpose verses 17, 18, placing them after 19*a*.

Verses 16, 17, 18 are omitted by the Coptic; and verses 17, 18 by the MSS. of the Peshitto, and by Lectionary 32.

The Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac transpose verses 17 and 18 and place them after 19 (which they retain entire); the Sinaitic also combines 20 (in part) with 17.

These variants may be studied best in the tabular form into which the Rev. W. B. Frankland has cast them, pp. 114–115 of his work, *The Early Eucharist*, London, 1902. The Rev. J. C. Lambert in Vol. IV. of *The Journal of Theological Studies*, pp. 187–188 gives an excellent summing up of the case for the authenticity of verses 19*b* and 20, with references to the opinions of a large number of scholars of different schools of thought, and of divers nationalities, nearly all of whom support the *Textus Receptus*. Cf. the dictum of a recent French writer: "Les versets suspects se trouvent conservés dans tous les manuscrits grecs existants; et le *Codex Bezae* n'est pas une exception, qui présente un grec manifestement calqué sur la traduction latine. Cette unanimité a

easily accounted for by the possibility that the scribe, not comprehending the distinction, marked so clearly by S. Luke, between the Passover and the Eucharist, would take out of the text what appeared to him to be a redundancy. Similar motives may have prompted the omission of verses 16–18 in the Coptic, and verses 17–18 in the Peshitto. The readings of the old Latin, and of the Curetonian and of the Sinaitic Syriac, respectively, present other attempts either to correct the supposed redundancy, or to supply the defect of a text that was before the copyist or translator, a text similar to that of *Codex Bezae*. The various readings of S. Luke (xxii. 14–20) are surely most easily explained upon the hypothesis of an early attempt (or attempts) to conform the text thereof to that of S. Matthew and of S. Mark, as the result of not appreciating that S. Luke describes, in order, two distinct things, the last Passover and the first Eucharist. The varying devices employed by different copyists or translators to remedy the supposed redundancy, served but to bring in a real confusion that had no previous existence. A quiet study of these variants, bearing in mind S. Luke's own statement at the beginning of his gospel, ought to be sufficient to set at rest any doubts one may have felt (under the spell cast by the great names of Westcott and Hort) of the genuineness of xxii. 19*b*, 20, and to cause one to regard S. Luke's account of Christ's last Passover and of His institution of the Eucharist (verses 14–20) as a legacy

paru aux meilleurs savants une preuve suffisante: si Wescott et Hort mettent encore le texte entre crochets, Gebhardt et Nestle le conservent sans contestation. L'omission de ces deux versets reste 'un accident' de l'antique tradition latine et syriaque.

"Mais leur authenticité est certaine: on ne peut les enlever à saint Luc qu'en donnant raison à un groupe restreint de manuscrits contre l'unanimité des autres. Un tel procédé n'est plus de la critique, mais de l'arbitraire."

Le Dogme de la Rédemption, par l'Abbé J. Rivière, Paris, 1905, p. 81.

TABLE V

St. Matt. xxvi. 26ᵃ, 29, 26ᵇ–28	St. Mark xiv. 22ᵃ, 25, 22ᵇ–24	St. Luke xxii. 14–20	1 Cor. xi. 23ᵇ–26
Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν —	Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν —	Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν· Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς·	Ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο
λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Πατρός μου.	ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.	

—λαβὼν ὁ Ιησοῦς ἄρτον	— λαβὼν ἄρτον	καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον	ἔλαβεν ἄρτον
καὶ εὐλογήσας	εὐλογήσας	εὐχαριστήσας	καὶ εὐχαριστήσας
ἔκλασεν καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς	ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς	ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς	ἔκλασεν
εἶπεν· Λάβετε φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.	καὶ εἶπεν· Λάβετε· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.	λέγων· Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον·	καὶ εἶπεν· Τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν·
		τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.	τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον	καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον	καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως	ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον
καὶ εὐχαριστήσας	εὐχαριστήσας	μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι,	μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι,
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς	ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.		
λέγων· Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.	καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.	λέγων· Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.	λέγων· Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι·
			τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
			ὁσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ.

of inestimable value to the Christian Church in all ages.[1] Following, therefore, the text of Dr. Eberhard Nestle,[2] and placing the four accounts in parallel columns, let us note some of their points of agreement and difference.[3]

S. Matthew and S. Mark connect the Institution of the Eucharist in a general way with His last Passover, without distinguishing clearly the two rites. S. Paul simply gives the occasion of the Institution as "in the night in which he was delivered up" without any reference to the Passover at all, for he is concerned not so much with the question of historical detail in the background of the first Eucharist, as with the Eucharist itself, the distinctive Christian service. S. Luke, however, who had made careful research,[4] distinguishes the Passover and the Eucharist, and puts our Lord's words concerning "the fruit of the vine,"[5] in their proper relation, namely, as referring to the Paschal cup (or cups). This amendment of the earlier form of the tradition was necessary for the Church at large, lest any confusion should arise. S. Luke's narrative, giving us not only the historical setting in greater fulness, but also bringing into strong relief the old (and vanishing) Passover and the new (Christian) sacrifice which is for all peoples and all times, corroborates silently S. Paul's world-wide promulgation of the Eucharist, and at the same time obviates any misconception arising from the less clearly articulated structure of the other two accounts. Let there be no mistake. The last Passover was one thing, Christ's Eucharist is another.

The most striking and most interesting thing, however, that a comparison of these four narratives reveals, is the fact that the sequence of Christ's procedure, the order

[1] See note 2 on p. 20.

[2] *Novum Testamentum Graece . . . curavit* Eberhard Nestle. *Editio sexta recognita.* Stuttgart, 1906. [3] See Table V., pp. 22–23.

[4] Luke i. 3: "Εδοξε κάμοὶ παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε.

[5] Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 18.

of His acts and words in regard to the bread and the cup respectively, is the same in all. The rationale of the original Eucharist as described in each account is identical. In spite of differences of detail there is complete uniformity of structure. Moreover, the variations of these parallel narratives are comparatively slight and do but serve to bring out more clearly the picture of what Christ did and said upon that ever memorable occasion. The order of the institution may be presented briefly thus:

(1) The setting apart of the bread and of the cup for the New Passover by the Saviour — "he took bread," "he took the cup."

(2) An act upon the part of Christ, described by two words (εὐχαριστεῖν, εὐλογεῖν) that are used synonymously here [1] (and afterward also by early Christian writers) — "he gave thanks," "he blessed." We must use both expressions in English if we wish to show the full content of this "thanksgiving-blessing."

(3) The distribution of either element to the disciples (the bread being first broken in order that they all might share in the one loaf that Christ had hallowed) with the statement appropriate to each — "This is My Body," etc., "This is My Blood," etc.

(4) The reiterated command — "Do this in remembrance of Me," "This do ye . . . in remembrance of Me."

Pondering over the significance of this uniformity, three things impress themselves upon our notice: (1) that after Christ had taken the bread and the cup for use in His new service, He made an act of prayer to God with words not recorded for us; and (2) that it was not until *after this* that He declared the nature of the gift

[1] Cf. Sadler on 1 Cor. xi. 24, New York, 1889, p. 180; Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, second edition, London, 1876, pp. 573–574; Watterich, *Der Konsekrationsmoment im heiligen Abendmahl*, Heidelberg, 1896, pp. 1–4; Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis*, etc.; Schaffhausen, 1864, pp. 294–301.

He proffered; and (3) that He added a command and gave a commission to do what He had done. In other words, the declarations, "This is My Body," etc., "This is My Blood," etc., were not made except at the distribution of each consecrated element, and this distribution did not take place until *after* Christ's act of "thanksgiving-blessing." We may therefore reasonably conclude that Christ consecrated the elements by His act of prayer to God for that end, and that His subsequent statements are not in any case words of blessing or consecration, but declarations of fact, of fact as effected by His blessing.[1] Moreover, as Christ bade His apostles to do what He had done, that command will be fulfilled and the priestly commission executed by the most exact compliance with His pattern that is possible. Moreover, no sophistry can set

[1] Cf. Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book V., Chap. LXVII., 4. (Works, Vol. II., pp. 82–83, Oxford, 1850.)

"They saw their Lord and Master with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven first bless and consecrate for the endless good of all generations till the world's end the chosen elements of bread and wine, which elements made for ever the instruments of life by virtue of his divine benediction," etc.

Cf. also Thorndike, *An Epilogue*, etc., Book III. *Of the Laws of the Church*, Chap. IV., § 6. (*Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. IV., p. 52.) "And is not Christ said to have 'blessed' the elements? Is it not said, that, having 'taken' and 'blessed' and 'broken' the bread, delivering it to His disciples, He affirmed it to be His Body at the present when He delivered it? Can the becoming of it His Body be imputed to the taking, or breaking, or delivering of it? Doth it not remain then, that it be imputed to the blessing of it?" (Cf. also pp. 195–197 below.)

Cf. the Decrees of the Council of Trent, Sess. XIII., cap. I., in which it is distinctly affirmed that Christ consecrated by His blessing and afterward testified to the truth of the gifts He proffered in the express words recorded in Holy Scripture. "Post panis, vinique benedictionem, se suum ipsius corpus illis praebere, ac suum sanguinem, disertis et perspicuis verbis testatus est." *Canones, et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici, et Generalis Concilii Tridentini*, etc., Romae, 1564, p. 72.

aside the rationale and sequence of those acts commanded to be followed, as made known to us from the fourfold witness of the New Testament. There is an irresistible logic of plain fact in the simple, almost bare narratives of the Evangelists and S. Paul that cuts at the root of all those subtleties invented in the later Middle Ages in order to justify a notion of Eucharistic consecration into which Western Christendom had drifted. It cannot be insisted upon too strongly that the words of declaration which Christ spoke were not in any sense words of blessing, but proclamations of fact. The *method* of Christ's consecration is recorded, but not the words He used.

This same act we have noted is described by two different words, employed synonymously, εὐχαριστεῖν, εὐλογεῖν.[1] It is surely most reasonable to believe that this is in order to complete the picture, the one word supplying a touch of meaning that is lacking in the other. Our Lord pronounced a special "thanksgiving" (or "blessing") over the bread and over the cup of the Eucharist. This "thanksgiving," while not identical with the Paschal one spoken shortly before it by Christ, yet bore such an analogy to its Jewish prototype as to be described by the same words, indicating that it, too, contained not only praise to God, but also prayer for God's blessing upon the material of the sacrifice, *i.e.* that the bread and the wine might become spiritual meat and drink.[2] This Eucharistic

[1] Cf. Dr. Swete, in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. III., p. 163, note 1. (The note on εὐχαριστία — εὐχαριστεῖν in the same volume of the *J. Th. S.*, pp. 594–598, by the late Dr. Hort, may be compared.)

[2] Cf. *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, Vol. XI., article SHEMONEH 'ESREH, pp. 270–282, especially pp. 270–272. It is easy to see the twofold character of many of these "benedictions." They contain not only thanks to God for some gift, but also a petition for His blessing upon it. Cf. Thorndike, *The Service of God at Religious Assemblies*, Chap. X., § 49 (*A.C.L.*, Vol. I., pp. 344–345). Cf. John Johnson, quoted below (Chap. V.), p. 212.

"thanksgiving" is the culmination and crown of other noteworthy similar acts on Christ's part, namely, in the pædagogic miracles of the feeding of the five thousand, and of the four thousand. Christ in His Eucharistic offering gives us the model to copy, *i.e.* His ἀναφορά or εὐχαριστία (in the broadest sense, as describing the whole act) = εὐχαριστία (in the narrower sense, as praise-giving) *plus* εὐλογία (as practically equivalent to ἐπίκλησις). Moreover, it is from this association of the two words that the Eucharist derived its early names of εὐχαριστία and εὐλογία, the first[1] being applied to the act of consecration, the consecrated elements, and to the whole service, and the second[2] to the act of consecration and to the consecrated elements chiefly. The beginning of these technical uses is already visible in the New Testament alongside of their more ordinary employment. It is indeed not too much to say, that εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν are practically equated for this special ecclesiastical use in post-Apostolic Greek, as may be seen in S. Justin Martyr's[3] use of εὐχαριστεῖν in the passive voice, which came thus to conform itself to the meaning and uses of the transitive εὐλογεῖν.[4] Thus it becomes impressed upon us that in the first Eucharist, Christ's consecration of the elements to be His Body and Blood, is contained in, and described for us under His act of "thanksgiving-blessing."

A Greek writer of the eighteenth century sums up the rationale of the first Eucharist thus:—

[1] Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 163. Cf. Brightman, *Liturgies E. and W.*, Vol. I., p. 589, *s.v.* Thanksgiving. Cf. Suicer, *Thesaurus*, *s.v.* εὐχαριστία, II.

[2] Cf. Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 597, *s.v.* εὐλογεῖν; *s.v.* εὐλογία. Cf. Suicer, *op. cit.*, *s.v.* εὐλογέω, III.; *s.v.* εὐλογία, IV.

[3] See Appendix, pp. 247, 248.

[4] Cf. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Boston, 1870, *s.v.* εὐχαριστέω, 3, pp. 545–546. Cf. Suicer, *op. cit.*, *s.v.* εὐχαριστέω. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, Appendix, p. 249.

"For our Lord Jesus celebrated His holy supper, both as God and as Man. As God on the one hand, by His Divine and all powerful will and operation, He blessed and consecrated the bread and wine to be His Body and Blood. As Man on the other hand, He joined to His Divine blessing prayers to God, and invocations, raising His eyes heavenward to the Almighty God, His Father, and giving thanks to Him, He blessed, hallowed and consecrated the bread and the cup. And this alone it is, which He commanded us to do, saying 'This do ye,' that is to say, what He did as Man. And again, what He did as God, it is impossible for the priest to imitate, but he [the priest] simply begs and invokes and implores, that the Holy Spirit, by the good pleasure of the heavenly Father, and the coöperation of His only-begotten Son, may descend, and make, and accomplish this Divine and ineffable consecration." [1] And again, "For Christ did not say 'Speak ye this,' but said 'Do ye this,' that is, 'Do ye, without variation, as ye saw Me do; I took bread, I gave thanks, I broke, I gave, I spoke. This do ye also. Take bread, give thanks, bless, break, give, speak.'" [2]

Evidence of the praxis of the Apostolic Church in the matter of the consecration of the Eucharist is clearly indicated by S. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 16: "the cup of the blessing, which [cup] we bless," etc.[3] The hallowing of the cup is distinctly postulated, and the difference also between the Christian "cup of the blessing," which is the "communion of the blood of Christ," and the Paschal "cup of blessing over food" plainly laid down.[4] It is

[1] Eustratius Argentes, *Against Azymes*, Part II., Postulate 2, §§ 68, 69. For the Greek, see Appendix, pp. 327–328. Cf. *ibid.*, §§ 72–76, Appendix, pp. 328–330.

[2] *Ibid.*, Part II., Postulate 2, Supplement II., Answer 3. For the Greek, see Appendix, p. 330.

[3] 1 Cor. x. 16: Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ;

[4] Cf. the Rev. G. H. Box in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. III., p. 362 (April, 1902).

impossible to escape the emphasis put upon the blessing or consecration of the cup, which causes it to become the "communion of the blood of Christ." Of the Eucharistic bread it is postulated similarly, that, as broken for distribution, it is "the communion of the body of Christ," thus involving its consecration prior to its being ministered to the communicants.

In another place in the same epistle, 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 17,[1] we have an instance of the use of εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν, most easily understood as referring to the Eucharistic blessing. This central act of blessing must be so made that it can be followed by him whose act it is and for whom it is offered, and who can thus express his assent thereto, in the exercise of his Christian lay-priesthood by responding, "Amen." "Else if thou bless in spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of layman say the 'Amen' at thy Eucharist, since he knoweth not what thou art saying? Thou, indeed, art giving thanks ['eucharisting'] well, but the other is not being edified." The early witness of S. Justin Martyr [2] for the people's "Amen" at the close of the Eucharistic prayer serves to strengthen this view of the passage. And taken in connection with the other (certain) references to the Eucharist in this epistle, it is surely most reasonable to regard the Apostle as alluding here also to the "thanksgiving" or "blessing" *par excellence* in the Church's celebration of her proper sacrifice, a feature, moreover, that had been so prominent an act of Christ's at the institution.

Again, does it not seem reasonable to think that in the epistle to the Romans, xv. 16,[3] S. Paul is applying to him-

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 17: Ἐπεὶ ἐὰν εὐλογῇς πνεύματι, ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου πῶς ἐρεῖ τὸ Ἀμὴν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ; ἐπειδὴ τί λέγεις οὐκ οἶδεν· σὺ μὲν γὰρ καλῶς εὐχαριστεῖς, ἀλλ' ὁ ἕτερος οὐκ οἰκοδομεῖται.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 247, 248.

[3] Romans xv. 16: Εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.

self, in illustrating his relation to the Gentile Christians, a figure of speech derived from the Christian sacrifice, *i.e.* the Eucharist, rather than from any Jewish oblation? There was no violent transition from the Apostolic to the post-Apostolic age, and the rationale of the Church's Eucharistic observance, as she emerges from her hiding place after the era of the persecution, conforms so closely to the lines of S. Paul's metaphor, that it seems unquestionably to have been the same from the beginning. S. Paul's priestly act in presenting with thanksgiving the oblations of bread and wine in commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, and the Divine acceptance of those gifts and the hallowing thereof by the Holy Spirit in answer to the Apostle's invocation, gives us the necessary (and, we may add, the only *adequate*) pattern for his comparison. "That I should be a minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering in sacrifice the gospel of God, in order that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." It is not the writer's purpose to set forth these last two passages as proofs positive, but at the same time, they seem to him to fall into line most naturally, as indications or hints of early Christian praxis, linking together and harmonizing Christ's institution on the one hand, and the earliest known liturgical remains on the other. In view of the undoubted fact that the Eucharist was the focus of Christian worship and the centre of the Church's corporate life from the first, and that Apostolic patterns were tenaciously held, it does not seem unreasonable to believe that S. Paul gives us a passing glimpse of the rationale of the Eucharistic Anaphora as followed out in his own day.[1]

There remains one more passage to which we may direct our attention for a moment. In the first epistle to

[1] Cf. Hickes, *The Christian Priesthood Asserted*, Chap. II., § X., *Works, A.C.L.*, Vol. II., pp. 93–100.

Timothy, iv. 4, 5,[1] in rebutting the error of those heretics who taught to abstain from meats (foods) which God created to be partaken of with thanksgiving, by those who believe and have a clear knowledge of the truth, S. Paul adds, "for every created thing of God is good, and not to be rejected, supposing it to be received with thanksgiving, for it is hallowed by the word of God and prayer." God at the beginning pronounced His handiwork to be good, and what He has made for food is to be taken with thankfulness, for it is sanctified to the ends for which He made it, by His own word as originally spoken, and by the prayer of the user that it may be blessed to his individual benefit. If this be true of the food that is taken for bodily nourishment merely, how much more so in the case of the Eucharistic bread and wine, consecrated to be the nurture of our souls! So clearly was this in the mind of the primitive Church, that we shall see these words of the Apostle early employed by Christian writers[2] in reference to the hallowing of the Eucharistic elements, as grounded on Christ's words of institution and command, as originally and once for all spoken, through the agency of the Church's prayer, or invocation.[3]

[1] 1 Timothy iv. 4, 5: "Οτι πᾶν κτίσμα Θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον· ἁγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως.

[2] *E.g.* Origen on Matt. xv. 11 (Appendix, p. 249); Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio Catechetica*, 37 (Appendix, p. 266).

[3] Cf. Thorndike, *An Epilogue*, etc. Bk. III., Chap. IV., § 7. (*A.C.L.*, Vol. IV., p. 53): "The creatures of God then are sanctified to the nourishment of our bodies by thanksgiving, with prayer for God's blessing; and shall we think, that that thanksgiving, wherewith they are sanctified to the nourishment of our souls, doth not include prayer to the effect intended, that they may become the Body and Blood of Christ, Which God by this sacrament pretends to feed our souls with? And doth not the execution of our Saviour's institution, when He says, 'Do this,' consist in giving God thanks for the redemption of mankind, with prayer, that we may be fed by the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the eucharist?"

Cf. Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, second edition, London, 1876, Chap. VI., § V., pp. 572 *seq.*, esp. pp. 577–580.

In concluding our brief survey of the New Testament witness to the rationale of Eucharistic consecration, may we not reasonably expect to find the great central act of the Liturgy, as celebrated by the post-Apostolic Church, following closely the pattern set by Christ Himself? Nor will our expectation be disappointed. When the Church comes together to celebrate the Holy Eucharist, we shall find hearts and minds lifted heavenward, and hear a solemn thanksgiving go up to God for His loving-kindnesses and tender mercies, interwoven with the praises which are offered to Him continually by the angelic hosts; and then, after the reiteration of Christ's Warrant by the rehearsal of the Narrative of His Institution of the Eucharist, the presentation and offering of the bread and wine in memorial of Him who died and rose again for us; and thereafter most humble prayer made to God the Father for the hallowing of the antitypes of bread and wine, — before the Church presumes to give them to Her children as the Body and Blood of Christ. Everywhere shall we find the Church consecrating the Eucharistic sacrifice by her prayer to her heavenly Father for His blessing upon the offered gifts. In later times, alas, we shall find the meaning of the Roman *Canon Missae* perverted by a new theory of consecration, and the weak English Prayer of Consecration involved in that misunderstanding, but our American Prayer of Consecration we shall find in agreement with all the other Liturgies of the Church Catholic, following the Apostolic model — that of the Master Himself.

CHAPTER III

THE PATRISTIC WITNESS AND THE LITURGICAL TRADITION [1] OF THE UNDIVIDED CHURCH

THE witness of the Fathers and of the early liturgical uses tells but one story. With great diversity of detail, the same principles are found running through the ecclesiastical writers of widely separated ages and places. The incidental character of much of the testimony also does but give it the greater value. Moreover, no dispute arose upon this point until the thirteenth [2] century, and the praxis of the whole Christian Church was uniform, until there was developed in the West a new rationale in the understanding of the *Canon Missae*, a development that took its rise in the twelfth [3] century and which made so rapid progress that by the fourteenth [4] century the Churches that paid homage to the see of Peter had not only forgotten their own earlier belief and practice, but had even come to impugn the unbroken tradition of the Eastern Churches as a novelty. The early testimony links on to

[1] This chapter includes the unbroken tradition regarding the rationale of Eucharistic consecration, which has been maintained by all the Oriental Churches to the present day. For while the objections made by Rome brought in controversy between East and West, they served but to strengthen the Eastern Christians in their adherence to the original tradition of the undivided Church.

[2] Cf. below, pp. 90–91, and Le Brun, *Défense*, etc., pp. 62–63.

[3] Its roots can be traced to the ninth century, as we shall see in Chap. IV., but not until after the Berengarian controversy, in the eleventh century, and after the new elevation of the host was introduced in the twelfth century, can the development be said to have begun.

[4] See below, pp. 95–96.

that contained in the New Testament, and the ever increasing stream of witnesses from the beginning, leaves the Roman digression (that arose so late) as an insignificant island in its midst. The witnesses who are to testify will speak for themselves without much comment. The original Latin or Greek will be found in the Appendix.

S. Justin Martyr (110–165 A.D.) is the first writer[1] who gives us clear evidence about the Eucharist as Liturgy. In his first *Apology*, in the course of chapters 65, 66, and 67, he says: "Then there is brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of water mixed with wine, and he taking them sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and makes thanksgiving at length for our being counted worthy of these things from Him. And when he has concluded the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present assent, saying, 'Amen.' Amen in the Hebrew tongue signifies, so be it. And when the president has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the consecrated bread and wine and water, and to those not present they carry away [a portion].

"And this food is called by us Eucharist. . . . For not as common bread and drink do we receive these. But in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour was incarnate by the Word of God, and had both flesh and blood for our sal-

[1] The *Didache* has nothing to our purpose, being entirely aside from the current of the Church's liturgical tradition. Cf. Bishop Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 53: "In the document called the *Didache* we have a specimen of an inadequate, indecisive Jewish Christianity. It has indeed broken with legalism and circumcision, — as a result in part of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple — but it has got no distinctive Christian theology beyond the barren recitation of the formula of baptism." Cf. Note L, pp. 374 *seq.*, esp. pp. 377–378, *The Church and the Ministry*, fourth edition, London, 1900.

vation, so also have we been taught that the food, from which our flesh and blood receive nourishment by assimilation, having been consecrated by prayer of the Word [1] that is from Him, is the Flesh and Blood of that same Jesus who was incarnate. For the Apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus handed down what was enjoined upon them: that Jesus took bread and when He had given thanks, said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me, this is My Body.' And likewise having taken the cup, and having given thanks, He said, 'This is My Blood,' and gave to them alone. . . . And, as we said before, when we have ceased from prayer, bread and wine and water is brought, and the president sends up prayers likewise and thanksgivings, according to his power, and the people assent saying, 'Amen.' And the distribution and the partaking of the consecrated elements by each takes place, and to those not present it is sent by the hand of the deacons." [2]

It is surely obvious to any fair-minded person reading these accounts that the apologist regarded the Eucharist to be consecrated by an act of prayer to God for that end, and that he appealed to the original institution as illustrating this fact. We note, too, that the rationale of the service as outlined by him is strictly in accord with the New Testament model.

S. Irenæus (120–202 A.D.) next claims our attention in his treatise, *Against Heresies*. His witness is unmistak-

[1] "Prayer of the Word that is from Him," may be taken, either as the prayer that flows out of the command, "Do this," and thus the Invocation is described from the point of view of carrying out of obedience to Christ's orders; or, "prayer of the Word," etc., may mean prayer for the coming of the Word upon the oblations; and the "Word" may even be equivalent to the Holy Spirit, in this connection. Cf. the Rev. J. H. Bethune-Baker's *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (London, 1903), p. 399, and note 1.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 247–248, for the Greek.

able. For instance, he says, "For as bread which is from the earth, receiving the invocation of God is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and an heavenly." [1] No interpretation of these words can stand except that the elements are consecrated by reason of prayer to God for that end. He also speaks of the same thing from a slightly different point of view: "When therefore the mingled cup and the manufactured bread receive the Word of God and become the Eucharist, the Body of Christ. . . . Just as a cutting from the vine planted in the ground bears fruit in its season, or as the grain of wheat falling into the ground and becoming decomposed is raised with manifold increase through the Spirit of God, who upholdeth all things, and then through the wisdom of God serves for the use of men, and having received the Word of God becomes Eucharist, that is the Body and Blood of Christ." [2] The reference here is either to the command of Christ as invoked upon the elements for their consecration, or to the consecration as the act of the Personal Word, the second Person of the Trinity, or, again, perhaps to the Word or utterance of the Invocation itself. Irenæus also gives us a most pertinent witness in his description of a Gnostic materialistic counterfeit of the Church's consecration of the Eucharist. He says of a certain Marcus, "Pretending to consecrate cups mixed with wine, and extending to great length the word of the Invocation, he makes them appear purple and reddish." [3] We may include here also the witness of the (second) Pfaffian fragment, without committing ourselves to its genuineness. It is quite in harmony with the other teaching of Irenæus, and also with the liturgical tradition that emerges into the light in the fourth century. "For we offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving

[1] Book IV., Chap. XVIII., 5; Appendix, p. 248.
[2] Book V., Chap. II., 3; Appendix, p. 248.
[3] Book I., Chap. XIII., 2; Appendix, p. 248.

thanks to Him that He bade the earth bring forth these fruits for our nurture, and then having completed the offering, we invoke the Holy Ghost to make this sacrifice, both the bread the Body of Christ, and the cup the Blood of Christ, so that those partaking of these antitypes may obtain remission of sins and life eternal." [1]

Tertullian (145–220 A.D.) gives us no direct testimony, although a passage from his treatise, *Against Marcion*, is alleged sometimes as evidence of the view that consecration of Eucharist is effected by the repetition of Christ's words. "The bread which He took and distributed to the disciples He made His Body, saying, 'This is My Body,' that is, a figure of My Body." [2] We should note that he is treating of the sacrament as distributed, in reference to the receiver, and omits from his allusion the mention of the previous blessing of the elements recorded in the New Testament. Tertullian's argument is to the effect that the appointment by Christ of bread as His sacramental or figurative Body is a proof of the reality of the flesh which Christ had. His words cannot fairly be pressed into any other meaning.[3]

Origen (185–252 A.D.) makes distinct reference to the primitive custom of consecration of the Eucharist by prayer. In his commentary on Matt. xv. 11, he says: "If all that enters into the mouth goes into the belly and is cast out in the draught, the food hallowed by the word of God and prayer also so far as it is material goes into the belly and is cast out in the draught; but in accord-

[1] See Appendix, p. 249. Cf. Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 401. Cf. Harvey's *Irenaeus*, Introduction, Vol. I., pp. clxx.–clxxii., Cambridge, 1857.

[2] See Appendix, p. 250.

[3] Even, however, if Tertullian had meant to assert that Christ in the institution made the bread to be the sacrament of His Body, by His declaration; this would by no means prove that he thought the Church was to consecrate merely by an historical recital of the narrative containing Christ's declaration.

ance with the prayer made over it, in accordance with the analogy of faith, it becomes profitable, and a cause of enlightenment of the mind that regards that which is profitable. For it is not the matter of the bread, but the word spoken over it that profits him that eats it not unworthily of the Lord." [1]

Again, in his book, *Against Celsus*, he says, "But we give thanks to the Creator of all, and with thanksgiving and prayer for the things we have received, we eat the bread that has been offered and has become by prayer a certain holy Body, which sanctifies those who partake of it with a right intention." [2]

S. Cyprian of Carthage (A.D. 200–258) tells us that "The oblation cannot be consecrated where the Holy Spirit is not." [3] He also alludes to the prayer of consecration, saying, "The priest, by way of preface before the prayer, prepares the minds of the brethren by saying, *Lift up your hearts.*" [4] And again, in speaking of one who makes divisions in the Church, he says, "An enemy of the altar, a rebel against Christ's sacrifice, for the faith faithless, for religion profane, a disobedient servant, an unfilial son, a hostile brother, having despised the bishops, and having forsaken God's priests, he dares to set up another altar, to make another prayer with unauthorized words, to profane the truth of the Lord's offering by false sacrifices." [5]

Firmilian of Cæsarea, writing to Cyprian, 256 A.D., speaks of a woman who even "dared frequently to do this, namely, to pretend that with an invocation not to be contemned she consecrated bread and made the Eucharist." [6]

Dionysius of Alexandria († c. 264 A.D.) says he would not dare to rebaptize "one who had listened to the consecration, and had joined in uttering the *Amen*, and who

[1] See Appendix, p. 249.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 249–250.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 250.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 250.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 250–251.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

had stood near the table and had stretched forth his hands to receive the holy food." [1]

S. Athanasius of Alexandria (296–373 A.D.) says, in a sermon to those preparing for baptism, "You will see the levites bringing breads and a cup of wine, and ordering the table. And so long as the intercessions and supplications have not been made, it is merely the bread and the cup. But when the great and wonderful prayers are completed, then the bread becomes the Body and the cup the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." [2] And again, "Let us come to the consecration of the mysteries. This bread and this cup, so long as the prayers and supplications have not been made, are mere elements. But when the great and holy supplications have been put up, the Word comes down upon the bread and the cup, and it becomes His Body." [3]

The *Ethiopic Church Ordinances* (c. 335 A.D.) contain an Anaphora which we must quote at least in part:—

"We give thee thanks, O Lord, in thy beloved Son Jesus Christ whom in the last days thou didst send unto us a saviour and redeemer, the angel of thy counsel, who is the Word from thee, through whom thou madest all things by thy will. And thou sentest him from heaven into the bosom of the virgin: he was made flesh and was carried in the womb and thy Son was revealed of the Holy Ghost that he might fulfil thy will and make a people for thee by stretching out his hands, suffering to loose the sufferers that trust in thee: who was delivered of his own will to the passion that he might destroy death and burst the bonds of Satan and trample on hades and lead forth the

[1] See Appendix, p. 251. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 251.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 251. Cf. also Eusebius of Cæsarea (*Panegyric upon Constantine*, IV., 9): "Who else than our Saviour alone gave the tradition to His disciples to consecrate the unbloody and reasonable sacrifices through prayers and an ineffable address to God?" See Appendix, p. 251.

saints, and establish a covenant and make known his resurrection. Therefore he took bread, gave thanks and said Take eat: this is my body which is broken for you. And likewise also the cup and said This is my blood which is shed for you: as often as ye do this ye shall do it in remembrance of me.

"Remembering therefore his death and his resurrection we offer thee this bread and cup giving thanks unto thee for that thou hast made us meet to stand before thee and do thee priestly service. We beseech thee that thou wouldest send thine Holy Spirit on the oblation of this church: give it together unto all them that partake [for] sanctification and for fulfilling with the Holy Ghost and for confirming true faith, that they may laud and praise thee in thy Son Jesus Christ, through whom to thee be glory and dominion in the holy church both now and ever and world without end. Amen." [1]

Our next witness is the recently discovered *Sacramentary* of Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, in Egypt, the prayers of which are dated about 350 A.D. It comes to us from a time when the custom still prevailed of each bishop setting forth his own liturgy, choosing his own phraseology, but conforming in plan or rationale to the general model or norm. The most remarkable feature of this liturgy is that the narrative of institution and the objective commemoration of Christ's death are so woven together as make it evident that Christ's declarations, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," are quoted simply as historical statements. The Invocation which follows cannot, therefore, be explained away by any ingenious sophistry. It is in the somewhat unusual form of a prayer for the descent of the Word upon the elements. This may be understood either as meaning the Holy Spirit, for Serapion's theology is a little hazy in the matter of the

[1] Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., pp. 189–190.

distinction of the Son and the Holy Spirit,[1] or as indicating the Personal Word. Whether we take this Invocation to be a prayer for the Holy Spirit to make the elements Christ's Body and Blood, or for the Second Person of the Holy Trinity to make them His own Body and Blood, the result is the same so far as the witness of this liturgical piece is concerned, and we are amply justified in quoting the combined Narrative of Institution and Oblation, and also the Invocation itself.

"Full is the heaven, full also is the earth, of Thy excellent glory, O Lord of Hosts: fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation: for to Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this unbloody offering. To Thee have we offered this bread, the likeness of the Body of the only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of His holy Body, for the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which He was betrayed took bread and brake and gave to His disciples saying, Take and eat, this is My Body which is being broken for you for remission of sins. Wherefore we also making the likeness of His death have offered the bread, and we beseech Thee through this sacrifice be reconciled to us all, and be merciful, O God of truth: and as this bread had been scattered upon the top of the mountains and having been gathered together became one, so also gather Thy holy Church out of every nation, and every country and every city, and village and house and make one living Catholic Church. We have offered also the cup, the likeness of His Blood, for the Lord Jesus Christ taking a cup, after supper, said to His own disciples, Take, drink, this is the new covenant, which is My Blood, which is being shed for you for remission of sins. Wherefore we also have offered the cup, presenting a likeness of His Blood. O God of truth, let Thy holy Word come to sojourn on this bread, that the bread may become the Body of the Word, and on this cup, that the cup may become

[1] Cf. Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 399, note 1, and p. 401 (note).

the Blood of the Truth. And make all who communicate, to receive a medicine of life for the healing of every sickness, and for the enabling of all advancement and virtue, not for condemnation, O God of truth, and not for censure and reproach. For Thee, the uncreated, have we invoked through the Only-begotten, in the Holy Spirit." [1]

The Anaphora of the *Liturgy of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions*, though it is the compilation of an unknown writer of heretical tendencies, made in the second half of the fourth century, bears its witness to the uniform tradition of consecration of the Eucharist by prayer or invocation. We will quote that part which most nearly corresponds to the Prayer of Consecration in the American Prayer Book.

"Remembering therefore those things which for our sake He endured, we give thanks to Thee, O God Almighty, not as we ought, but as we are able, and fulfil His institution. For in the same night in which He was betrayed, taking bread in His holy and undefiled hands, and looking up to Thee His God and Father, and breaking it, He gave it to His disciples, saying, This is the Mystery of the New Testament, take of it, eat, this is My Body, which is broken for many for the remission of sins. Likewise also having mingled the cup with wine and water, and having hallowed it, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, this is My Blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; do this in remembrance of Me: for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew forth My death till I come.

"Wherefore remembering His passion, death, and resurrection from the dead, His return into heaven, and His future second appearing, when He shall come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works; we offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to His institution, this bread

[1] See Appendix, pp. 252–253.

and this cup, giving thanks to Thee through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and do Thee priestly service. And we beseech Thee, that Thou wilt look graciously on these gifts lying before Thee, O Thou self-sufficing God; and accept them to the honour of Thy Christ. And send down Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, on this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ. That all who shall partake of it may be confirmed in godliness, may receive remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his deceit, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of Thy Christ, and may obtain everlasting life; Thou, O Lord Almighty, being reconciled to them." [1]

The witness of S. Cyril of Jerusalem (315–386 A.D.) next claims our attention, forming as it does the meeting point of the early patristic testimony and the direct witness of the earliest liturgical remains. In the course of his catechetical lectures to those who had been baptized, in preparation for their participation in the Liturgy of the Faithful, and for the reception of Holy Communion, we note the following statements: "For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist before the invocation of the holy and adorable Trinity were simple bread and wine, while after the invocation the bread becomes the Body of Christ, and the wine the Blood of Christ, so," etc.[2] "For as the bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Ghost is mere bread no longer, but the Body of Christ, so," etc.[3] The last lecture is a commentary on the Anaphora of the Liturgy of Jerusalem as then in use.

"The priest cries aloud, *Lift up your hearts.* . . . Then ye answer, *We lift them up unto the Lord.* . . . Then the priest says, *Let us give thanks unto the Lord.* . . . Then ye say, *It is meet and right,* for in giving thanks we do a thing meet and right. . . . After this we make mention

[1] See Appendix, pp. 253–254. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 254. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 254.

of heaven and earth and sea; of sun and moon; of stars, and of all creation rational and irrational, visible and invisible; of angels, archangels, virtues, dominions, principalities, powers, thrones, of the many-faced cherubim, in effect repeating that call of David's 'O magnify the Lord with me.' We make mention also of the seraphim, whom Esaias in the Holy Spirit saw standing around the throne of God, with two wings veiling their face, with twain their feet, with twain flying, and saying, 'Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts.' For we recite this divine song that has been handed down to us from the seraphim, in order that we may be partakers in the hymn of praise with the hosts of the world above.

"Then having sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns, we beseech the merciful God to send forth the Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him; in order that He may make the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine the Blood of Christ; for whatsoever the Holy Spirit has touched is sanctified and changed." [1]

A little later in the same lecture we read, in reference to the showing of the sacrament to the people as an invitation to communion: "After these things [the intercession and the Lord's Prayer] the priest says, 'Holy things to the holy.' Holy are the offered gifts, having received the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit." [2]

In this description we see the Liturgy of the Christian Church fully established, and have a plain, unmistakable interpretation of its salient parts. The Narrative of Institution, being purely historical, is passed over in silence. The Invocation, on the contrary, is so essential that it receives special and reiterated mention.[3] It is impossible honestly to explain away the distinct statements of S. Cyril.

[1] See Appendix, pp. 254–255. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 255.

[3] See Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., p. 469, notes 9 and 11.

S. Optatus of Milevis (fl. c. 368) writing on the schism of the Donatists, asks: "What is so sacrilegious as to break down, raze, and remove the altars of God, on which you also formerly offered, on which also the vows of the people and the members of Christ were laid, whither Almighty God was invoked, whither having been petitioned for, the Holy Ghost descended?" [1]

S. Basil of Cæsarea (330–378 A.D.) speaks of the Invocation as part of the unwritten Apostolic tradition of the Church. "Which of the saints has left in writing the words of the Invocation at the consecration of the bread of the Eucharist, and of the cup of blessing? For we are not sufficed with those words which the Apostle or the Gospel recorded, but we say other words, both before and after, as having the great power with reference to the mystery, which we received from the unwritten teaching." [2]

S. Ambrose of Milan (340–397 A.D.) asks, in reference to the Holy Spirit, "How, then, does He not possess all things that pertain to God, Who is named with the Father and the Son by the priests in baptism, and is invoked in the oblations?" [3] He also says, in another treatise, "Now we, as often as we receive the sacraments, which through the mystery of the sacred prayer are transfigured into [Christ's] Flesh and Blood, do show the Lord's death." [4]

These passages show S. Ambrose to be entirely *en rapport* with the general tradition of the Church in his view of the rationale of Eucharistic consecration. There are passages in other writings of his, namely, *Of the Blessings of the Patriarchs*, and *Of the Mysteries* (and also in the treatise *Of the Sacraments*, which last is generally considered to be inspired by S. Ambrose's *Of the Mysteries*, or to be

[1] See Appendix, p. 255.
[2] *De Spiritu Sancto*, 27; see Appendix, p. 256.
[3] *De Spiritu Sancto*, III., 16; see Appendix, p. 256.
[4] *De Fide*, IV., 10; see Appendix, p. 256.

founded upon it, and to have been written c. 400 A.D.[1]), which were pressed into service in the ninth and succeeding centuries, as supposed props for the new theory of Eucharistic consecration, which began to germinate in the West at that time.[2] Examined impartially, however, they are by no means found to contradict the other statements of S. Ambrose quoted above, nor do they really give any support to that theory which grew up long after they had been written, a theory that was not even dreamed of in the eighth century, to say nothing of those that went before.

In the ninth chapter, *Of the Blessings of the Patriarchs*, occur these words: "And indeed rich is that bread which whoso eats cannot hunger. This bread He [Christ] gave to His disciples to distribute to the faithful; and to-day He gives to us that bread which He Himself daily as priest consecrates by His own words." [3] Now in view of the fact that our Lord's words in S. John vi. 49–52 are quoted just after this, it is evident that S. Ambrose is here speaking of Christ as fulfilling His pledge of giving His Flesh and Blood to Christians in all ages through His appointment of the Eucharistic food. Christ is back of and above every Eucharist to make good His promise to grant His Flesh as the bread from heaven. The more the passage is studied, the more one becomes convinced that there is not the shadow of suggestion in it, that the Eucharist is to be considered consecrated, merely by the priest reciting our Lord's words of declaration, which He addressed to His disciples in the administration of the sacrament: "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood."

In his treatise *Of the Mysteries* he says: "Perhaps you will say, I see something else, how do you allege to me that I receive Christ's Body? And this yet remains for

[1] See Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, London, 1903, pp. 177–178.

[2] See Chap. IV., p. 146.

[3] See Appendix, p. 257.

us to prove. What evidence do we employ? Let us prove that this is not what nature formed, but what the blessing consecrated: and that the power of the blessing is greater than that of nature, because by the blessing even nature itself is changed." After mentioning many of the miracles recorded in the Old Testament, he continues: "We observe then that grace has more power than nature, and yet up to this point, we are only counting the grace of a prophet's blessing. But if a human blessing had so great power as to change nature, what do we say concerning the Divine consecration where the very words of the Lord and Saviour operate? For that sacrament which you receive, is made by Christ's word. But if the word of Elias had so great power as to bring down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ have power to change the kind of the elements? Thou hast read concerning the making of the whole world, 'He spake and they were made, He commanded and they were created.' Therefore the word of Christ, which could make out of nothing what was not, can it not change those things that are into what they were not? For it is not less to give new natures to things than to change them.

"But why do we use arguments? Let us use His own example of the incarnation. Did the custom of nature precede when Jesus was born of Mary? If we seek the [usual] order, a woman has been wont to conceive after connection with a man. It remains therefore that a virgin conceived outside of the order of nature, and this Body which we make is that which is of the Virgin. Why do you seek the order of nature in the Body of Christ, since the Lord Jesus Himself was born of a virgin outside nature. True was the flesh of Christ which was crucified, which was buried; truly therefore this is the sacrament of that flesh.

"The Lord Jesus proclaims, This is My Body. Before the blessing of the heavenly words another kind is named, after the consecration the Body is signified. He Himself

speaks of His Blood. Before the consecration it has another name, after the consecration it is called Blood. And you say, *Amen*, that is, it is true. What the mouth utters, let the mind within confess. Let the soul feel what the word appears to mean." [1]

This passage also has been alleged to assert that consecration of the Eucharist upon the part of the Church is accomplished by the repetition of Christ's words of administration. We will examine it, therefore, somewhat closely.

In order to do so with equity we must start from a consideration of the environment in which this treatise was written, and not from an imaginary background such as the later prevailing Scholastic theory of Eucharistic consecration would place behind it. We must remember (1) the Greek character of the Ambrosian rite at this time, as also that of the other Western rites known as Gallican.[2] S. Ambrose's statements in his treatises *Of the Holy Spirit* and *Of Faith*, already quoted are entirely in accord with the acknowledged tradition of the Eastern Church from the earliest times until to-day, and show a Liturgy in use parallel with that described by S. Cyril of Jerusalem, in the rationale of the Anaphora. We must also (2) remember that while no exact moment was defined as yet, at which the elements were considered to be consecrate, nevertheless the whole of what we call the Prayer of Consecration was thought necessary to be said to the end of the Invocation.[3] We must fulfil our Eucharistic obedience not only

[1] See Appendix, pp. 256–257.

[2] Cf. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, London, 1903, pp. 88, 93–94.

[3] Cf. Dom Cabrol, in the *Dict. d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, article AMEN, col. 1558: "L'*action* est une, les différents moments n'en sont pas divisibles, elle n'est considérée comme accomplie qu'à la fin de l'épiclèse." Cf. *ibid.*, col. 1559, *in re* "consecratio," "ce mot à cette époque a un sens plus général qu'aujourd'hui et signifie toute l'action."

by offering the memorial gifts, but by impetrating for their acceptance and for their hallowing. It should also (3) be kept in mind that the Prayer of Consecration or Anaphora, as such, is not described or explained by S. Ambrose in detail, although he alludes to it and bases his argument upon its efficacy, in order to satisfy the new communicants that they receive more than the senses witness to, when they take the sacrament. It is the sacrament as delivered to those who approach to receive it, that is under primary consideration.

The first thing that we should notice (in § 50) is that S. Ambrose appeals to the "blessing" as that which consecrated the Eucharist. This is a term used to denote the part of the Liturgy which we call the Prayer of Consecration.[1] Again (in § 52) he refers to the same thing. If Elijah's prayer to God on Mount Carmel was answered by the fire of God's acceptance coming down from heaven and consuming the sacrifice,[2] shall not the command of Christ avail to the hallowing of the elements? Does not the utterance of Christ (who called the world into being by His command) become effective through the act of consecration? Christ's words of declaration as He gave the Eucharist to His disciples, viz. "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," become effectual[3] to us by reason of the Divine Consecration, the Prayer of Blessing made after the example of the prophet Elijah.[4] Christ's proclamation (§ 54) at the first Eucharist: "This is My Body," and

[1] Cf. Dom Cabrol, *op. cit.*, article ANAPHORE, col. 1899: "Les noms latins de *canon missae, canon sacrificii, actio*, et même *praedicatio* ou *benedictio*, designent la même partie de la messe que l'anaphore."

[2] See 1 Kings xviii. 36–38.

[3] Cf. S. Chrysostom, Sermons I and II., *De Prodit. Judae.* See below, pp. 58–59, and Appendix, pp. 262–263.

[4] Cf. S. Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, III., 4. See below, p. 56, and Appendix, p. 261. Cf. also S. Gregory of Nyssa, *In laudem fratris Basilii.* See below, p. 61, and Appendix, p. 265.

His statement that it was His Blood He was giving to His disciples, are the Church's warrant for that blessing which she pours forth in obedience to the "heavenly words," that act of consecration which makes, by the beseeching of the Divine acceptance and hallowing, the bread and wine to be the Body and Blood of Christ. To this act the worshipper answers "Amen." It is surely thus plainly evident that S. Ambrose is a clear witness in this treatise also for the primitive tradition of the Church, namely, the consecration of the Eucharist by God in answer to her Invocation.

The treatise *Of the Sacraments* follows very closely the thought and diction of S. Ambrose's *Of the Mysteries*, and therefore claims our attention next. In the one case as in the other, the object of the writer is to reassure the communicant, who is being admitted for the first to the full privileges of Christian discipleship, of the fact that more is received in the Holy Communion than mere bread and wine. In Book IV., Chap. IV., § 14, we read:—

"Perhaps thou sayest: 'My bread is the usual kind.' But that is bread before the words of the sacraments: when the consecration[1] has taken place, of the bread is made the Flesh of Christ. Let us therefore prove this. How can what is bread be the Body of Christ? By reason of the consecration.[1] Moreover, by virtue of what words, by virtue of whose utterances? Those of the Lord Jesus. For indeed all the other things which are said in the preceding [parts of the service], are said by the priest, praises are offered to God, petition is made for the people, for kings, for others: when the time comes that the venerable sacrament should be made, the priest does not utilize[2] his own utterances, but utilizes the utterances of Christ. Therefore the utterance[3] of Christ makes this sacrament.

[1] Cf. p. 49, note 3. [2] See p. 50, note 3.

[3] "Sermo," practically equivalent in this passage to "command."

"§ 15. What is the utterance of Christ? Forsooth that by which all things were made. The Lord gave the command, and the heaven was made, the Lord commanded and the earth was made; the Lord commanded and the seas were made: the Lord commanded and the whole creation was generated. Thou seest therefore how effective is the utterance of Christ. If therefore there is so much power in the utterance of the Lord Jesus, that things which were not should begin to be, how much more effective is it, that things should be what they were, and be changed to something else. The heaven was not, the sea was not, the land was not, but hearken unto David saying: 'He spake and they were made; He commanded and they were created.'

"§ 16. Therefore that I may reply to thee, it was not the Body of Christ before the consecration:[1] but after the consecration[1] I tell thee that indeed it is the Body of Christ. 'He spake and it was made: He commanded and it was created.'[2] Thou wast thyself, but thou wast an old creature: after thou wast consecrated thou didst begin to be a new creature. Dost thou wish to know *how* a new creature? 'Every one,' quoth he, 'in Christ is a new creature.'

"§ 17. Receive therefore after what manner the utterance of Christ has been accustomed to change the whole creation, and changes when He wills the ordinances of nature. 'In what manner,' dost thou ask again? Take this, and first of all things let us receive an example from His [Christ's] generation. It is the usual thing that man is not begotten except of a man and a woman, and by conjugal intercourse; but because the Lord willed, because He chose this sacrament, Christ was born of the Holy Spirit and a virgin, that is, the Mediator of God and men,

[1] Cf. p. 49, note 3.

[2] Note again the emphasis laid upon the idea of Christ's *command*.

the Man Christ Jesus. Thou seest therefore that contrary to the ordinances and order [of nature] He was born, that Man was born of a virgin." [1]

Then after citing (§ 18) a few miracles from the Old Testament, he continues: —

"§19. Dost thou not therefore understand from all these how much the heavenly utterance [2] operates? If it was operative in an earthly fountain, if the heavenly utterance was operative in other things, is it not effective in the heavenly sacraments? Therefore thou hast learned that of bread the Body of Christ is made, and that wine and water is put into the cup, but it becomes His Blood by the consecration [3] of the heavenly word." [4]

The parallel between this and the argument in S. Ambrose's *Of the Mysteries* is sufficiently obvious. The Church's act of consecration it is which makes the elements to be the Body and Blood of Christ. His words are brought into operation by the priest in the Prayer of Consecration (which is next to be quoted at length).[5] It is particularly to be noted that the writer of the treatise *Of the Sacraments* does not up to this point even mention Christ's words of declaration, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," which he would most surely have done if he had known the later notion of consecration by the mere repetition of them.[6] Nor only so, he dwells so emphatically on the utterance of Christ as a command,[7] that it is plain that he was in entire accord with the tradition of the whole Church, which, after rehearsing the Narrative of the Institution, including, of course, that command, "Do this for My memorial," which instituted the Eucharist as the perpetual commemorative sacrifice of the Christian Church, — presents the elements as the anti-

[1] See Appendix, pp. 258–259.
[2] Cf. p. 50, note 3.
[3] Cf. p. 49, note 3.
[4] See Appendix, p. 259.
[5] See below, pp. 54–56.
[6] See Chapter IV., pp. 146–159.
[7] Cf. p. 52, note 2.

types of Christ's Body and Blood and then prays for their acceptance by God, and for His hallowing of them to be the sacraments of His Body and Blood. The hidden reality of the sacraments is effected by the act of consecration, which is the instrumental means of carrying into effect the precept and the promise of the heavenly words of Christ.

In the sequel the writer gives a Prayer of Consecration[1] parallel to the preliminary Invocation, the Narrative of Institution, the Oblation, and the Invocation proper,[2] of the *Canon Missae*. All that he quotes is introduced by the formula: "The priest says." On the Narrative of Institution he comments a little, but what he says is strikingly different from what the modern Roman theory of Eucharistic consecration would require. This narrative is plainly historical in the writer's mind. The "words" of Christ whereby He consecrated the bread and wine to be His Body and Blood are, by the strongest kind of implication, His words (unrecorded by the evangelists) of blessing,[3] and just as clearly are His words of declaration described as those by which He testified to the gift He gave to His disciples; and moreover it is the truth of these words for us which we confess, when we reply "Amen" to the priest saying, "The Body of Christ," as he administers to us.

"Dost thou wish to learn that it is consecrated by the heavenly words? Receive what these words are. The priest says: 'Make for us,' quoth he, 'this oblation approved, ratified, reasonable, acceptable: that is a figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who the day before He suffered took bread in His holy hands, looked up to heaven giving thanks to Thee, Holy Father, Almighty,

[1] Book IV., Chap. v., §§ 21–25, and Chap. vi., §§ 26–27.

[2] Cf. Chap. IV., pp. 124–125, 127–131, and Appendix, pp. 360–361.

[3] The only words of Christ that come between the act of taking the bread or cup, and His testification to His disciples, are those indicated and described by the phrase "He blessed it."

Everlasting God, He blessed it, He brake it, and having broken it, He delivered it to His Apostles and disciples, saying: Take and eat ye all of this: for this is My Body, which will be broken for many. Likewise also after supper the day before he suffered, He took the cup, looked up to heaven giving thanks to Thee, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, He blessed it, He delivered it to His Apostles and disciples, saying: Take and drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood.' Look at all those. Those are the evangelist's words as far as 'Take ye,' be it Body or Blood. Then the words are Christ's: 'Take and drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood.' And look at particulars. 'Who the day before He suffered,' quoth he, 'took bread in His holy hands.' Before it is consecrated, it is bread: when moreover Christ's words have been added,[1] it is Christ's Body. And finally hear Him saying: 'Take and eat ye all of it for this is My Body.' And before the words of Christ, it is a cup, full of wine and water: when the words of Christ have operated, then it is made Christ's Blood, which redeems His people. Therefore ye see how many ways the utterance of Christ is powerful to change all kinds of things. Then the Lord Jesus Himself bears witness to us that we receive His Body and His Blood. Ought we to have any doubt concerning His faith and testimony?" [2]

After a brief digression affirming the superiority of the Body of Christ to the manna,[3] the writer continues:—

"Therefore not idly dost thou say: 'Amen,' actually confessing in thy spirit that thou receivest the Body of Christ. The priest says to thee: 'The Body of Christ;' and thou sayest: 'Amen,' that is, 'it is truth.' What the tongue confesses, let the heart hold fast." [4]

Coming back to his quotation of the Prayer of Consecration, he proceeds:—

[1] His words of blessing—"He blessed it."

[2] See Appendix, pp. 259–260.

[3] IV., v., 24. Appendix, p. 260.

[4] See Appendix, p. 260.

". . . Then how great a sacrament it is, recognize. Look at what He says: 'As often as ye do this, so often shall ye make My Memorial, until I come.' And the priest says: 'Therefore being mindful of His most glorious Passion, and His Resurrection from the dead, and His Ascension into Heaven, we offer to Thee this spotless offering, a reasonable offering, an unbloody offering, this holy bread and cup of life eternal: and we beseech and implore, that Thou wouldest receive this oblation upon Thy sublime Altar by the hands of Thy angels, as Thou didst vouchsafe to receive the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our forefather Abraham, and that which the High-priest Melchizedek offered unto Thee.'" [1]

S. John Chrysostom (347–407 A.D.) bears plain witness in many parts of his writings to the uniform tradition of the Church. In his treatise *Of the Priesthood*, after a graphic reference to Elijah on Mount Carmel, he proceeds: "Pass then from this scene to the rites now celebrated, and you shall see them not only wonderful but transcending all astonishment. There stands the priest, not bringing down fire but the Holy Spirit; and he makes prolonged supplication, not that some flame sent down from on high may consume the offerings, but that grace descending on the sacrifice, should by means of it enlighten the souls of all." [2]

"And when he invokes the Holy Spirit, and consummates the most dread sacrifice, tell me, what rank shall we give him?" [3]

In his homilies we may note the following allusions: —

"What art thou doing, O man, when the priest stands before the table, lifting up his hands to heaven, invoking the Holy Spirit to come and touch the offered

[1] See Appendix, p. 260.
[2] III., 4. See Appendix, p. 261.
[3] VI., 4. See Appendix, p. 261.

gifts? There is a great hush, a great silence. When the Spirit is giving His grace, when He comes down, when He touches the offered gifts, when you behold the Lamb slain and completely offered, is it then that you bring in tumult, disturbance, strife and abuse?" [1]

"He that is present is doing nothing, nor is there anything of human nature in the right disposition of the offered gifts, but it is the grace of the Spirit being present, and coming down upon all, that completes this mystical sacrifice." [2]

"The flesh of the Lord because of God the Word is bread; so then also this bread because of the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, becomes heavenly bread." [3]

In his second homily on the second Epistle to Timothy, he identifies (or shows the essential unity of) the original institution of the Eucharist and each celebration of it by any Christian priest since, emphasizing the fact that God works through His ministers. "The offering is the same, whether any one you please, or whether Paul or Peter, offer it; it is the same, that which Christ gave to the disciples, and that which now the priests make. This is nowise inferior to that, because even this men do not hallow, but He Himself who has hallowed also that. For as the words which God uttered are the same which the priest now reads, so also the offering is the same." [4] We should note that there is no hint that Christ's words are repeated for the purpose of effecting consecration of the elements thereby. Moreover, it is the peculiarity of Christ's dispensation as remarked in the context, that the Holy Spirit has come down. The relation of Christ's words of institution to each celebration is brought out clearly in the two homilies *On the Treason of Judas* now to be quoted.

[1] *De coem. et cruce*, 3. See Appendix, p. 261.
[2] *In Pent.*, 1. See Appendix, p. 262.
[3] *In Joan.*, xlv. See Appendix, p. 262.
[4] See Appendix, p. 262.

"Christ is present, and He who prepared that table, He also prepares this. For it is not a man who makes the offered gifts to become Christ's Body and Blood, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The priest stands fulfilling his office, uttering those words; but the power and grace are God's. 'This is My Body,' he says; this word puts the offered gifts in another rank. And as that word saying, 'Increase and multiply and replenish the earth,' was spoken indeed once for all, but through all time becomes effective, giving power to our nature for the procreation of children; so also this word once for all spoken, so far as each table in our churches is concerned, from that day until now and until His coming again, works the perfected sacrifice." [1] Christ's statement did indeed put the bread and wine He presented to His disciples in the first Eucharist, in another category from the Paschal bread and cup. And it is these words as spoken *once for all* by Christ that bear a parallel relation to the creative words at the beginning of the world. But it is the statement, "This is My Body," as thus spoken by Christ, and not as recited by the priest, that becomes effective in the celebration of the Eucharist by the Church. The power and grace are of God, we are told here, and this power and grace we learn from other statements of the same author are obtained at each celebration of the Eucharist, by prayer to God for that end. The Narrative of Institution was apparently recited in the Prayer of Consecration in S. Chrysostom's time for the same reasons as it is to-day with us, to show our warrant for celebrating the service, and to show the source of the power that consecrates and quickens the elements which we offer.

The second homily repeats the thought in almost the same words: "Christ also is now present preparing the table. For it is not a man who makes the offered gifts to become Christ's Body and Blood. The priest stands

[1] See Appendix, pp. 262–263.

fulfilling his office only, and offers supplication; but the grace and the power that accomplish all things are God's. 'This is My Body,' he says. This word puts the offered gifts in another rank. And as that word saying, 'Increase and multiply, and replenish the earth,' was a word and became a work, empowering human nature for the procreation of children; so also this word spoken, continually makes to grow in grace those who partake worthily." [1] We should note that the priest is here described as praying, and that the subjective benefit of the sacrament is also strongly before the writer's mind.

Ephraem Syrus (c. 308 A.D.–c. 378) tells us that "The priesthood with confident boldness seeks to rise from earth to heaven, until it may behold Him that is invisible; and falling down in worship it prays . . . that the Spirit the Comforter may come down and hallow the gifts offered on earth." [2]

The same writer in somewhat similar method to that of Chrysostom's homilies *On the Treason of Judas* says: "Do not think that this bread and wine which you see, remain the same. By no means, brother. Do not believe that. By the prayers of the priests and by the coming of the Holy Spirit, the bread becomes the Body and the wine the Blood [of Christ]. . . . How I ask is He not able to bring it about, that the bread is the very Body and the wine the Blood of Christ Himself? In the beginning He commanded the earth to bring forth grass, and therefore to this hour, it brings forth grass, by the power of the Divine command which it received in the beginning, when the heaven sends rain. Now indeed in a similar way, God says, 'This is My Body, this is My Blood,' and 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' Since therefore all things are accomplished by His Almighty command until He Himself comes, even as He says, 'Till I come;' and since when the rain falls upon the

[1] See Appendix, p. 263.
[2] *De Sacerdotio*. See Appendix, p. 263.

earth, the grass revives: so indeed also this spiritual rain, that is the Holy Spirit, coming in answer to the prayers of the priests, by His own power makes without doubt this bread the Body and the wine the Blood [of Christ]." [1]

Again, in commenting upon a vision of Ezekiel he says: "These coals, and the man clothed in linen drawing them out and scattering them over the people, are a figure of the priests of God, through whom the coals of the living and life-giving Body of our Lord are dispensed. Forsooth meantime another angel reaches out his hand, takes the coals, and forthwith hands them to the man clothed in linen. This hints a mystery, that it is not by the priest himself that [Christ's] Body can be made from bread, but by Another, that is the Holy Spirit; and that the priest as a mediator only lifts his hands, and with his lips offers prayers and supplications as an humble servant." [2]

This testimony surely calls for no explanation to make it clear.

Peter II. of Alexandria († 381 A.D.) speaks of "The holy altar where we invoke the descent of the Holy Spirit." [3]

Gregory of Nyssa (330–395 A.D.) in his sermon *On the Baptism of Christ*, says: "The bread again is at first common bread, but when the sacramental action hallows it, it is called and becomes Christ's Body. So also the sacramental oil, so the wine, being of little value before the blessing, after the sanctification by the Spirit, each has a differing energy." [4]

In his canonical epistle to Letoius, bishop of Melitene, he speaks of a penitent who "has as his time of repentance his whole lifetime. For never is he thought worthy to worship God with the congregation while the sacramental prayer is being made; but he will pray apart, a stranger to the communion of the holy gifts his whole life." [5]

[1] *De Sanct. et viv. ch. sacr.* See Appendix, p. 264.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 264.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 264.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 265.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

In his funeral oration upon Basil, he says: "The priesthood of the teacher copies the pattern of the priesthood of Elias, drawing down, in the threefold summoning by the word of faith, the heavenly fire upon his sacrifice. And we have been taught that the power of the Holy Spirit is oftentimes called fire in the scripture." [1]

In his *Oratio Catechetica* we find additional witness. From the thirty-third chapter to the thirty-sixth inclusive he treats of Baptism, and makes frequent allusion to prayer to God and invocation of His grace as factors in the application of regeneration. Thus he says: "When they have heard these things and the like, and have been taught the manner, that it is prayer to God and invocation of heavenly grace, and water, and faith through which the mystery of regeneration is accomplished, they are incredulous, looking to that which is seen, as if that which operates corporeally agreed not with the promise; for how, they say, does prayer and invocation of Divine power that is made over the water become a source of life to those initiated?" [2] The relation of our prayer to God's grace and His promise to give are discussed very thoroughly in Chapter thirty-four. Gregory rebuts even the objection that God being everywhere does not work specially in any particular place or rite. "What difficulty is there for the matter in hand, namely, to believe that God is everywhere, and that being in all things, He is present also to those who invoke His life-giving power, and that being present, He does that which it befits Him to do?" [3]

With this background we can the better see the force of the following quotation from the chapter on the Eucharist: "For that which is characteristic of all men is acknowledged also in the case of that flesh, namely that that Body too was maintained by bread; which Body also by the indwelling of God the Word was raised to the dignity of Godhead. Rightly, then, do we believe that now also

[1] See Appendix, p. 265. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 265. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 266.

the bread which is consecrated by the Word of God is changed into the Body of God the Word. For that Body was virtually bread, but has been consecrated by the indwelling of the Word that tabernacled in the flesh. Therefore from the same cause by which the bread that was transformed in that Body was changed to a divine potency, a similar result takes place now. For as in that case, the grace of the Word used to make holy the Body, the substance of which came of the bread, and in a manner was itself bread, so also, in this case the bread, as says the Apostle, 'is consecrated by the Word of God and by prayer'; not that it advances by the process of eating to become the Body of the Word, but it is at once changed into the Body through the Word, as was said by the Word, 'This is My Body.' . . . Since, then, that God-containing Flesh partook also of this part for its substance, and since the God who was manifested infused Himself into a perishable nature for this purpose, that by the communion with Deity humanity might be deified, for the sake of this, by dispensation of His grace, He disseminates Himself in all believers through that Flesh composed of bread and wine, blending Himself with the body of believers, in order that, by this union with that which is immortal, man may be a partaker of incorruption. These things He gives by the power of the blessing, transforming the nature of the visible to that thing." [1]

It is obvious that Gregory regards the elements to be consecrated by the Personal Word (*i.e.* the Second Person of the Holy Trinity), this consecration being granted in response to prayer therefor, and being grounded upon Christ's own original institution and declaration regarding the elements, as consecrated by Himself.

Theophilus of Alexandria in his Paschal Letter, A.D. 402,

[1] Cf. The Rev. J. H. Srawley's edition of the *Oratio Catechetica*, Cambridge, 1903, Introduction, pp. xxxvii, xxxviii; pp. 149–150, and 152, notes. See Appendix, p. 266.

comments as follows upon a dictum of Origen's: "For he says that the Holy Spirit operates not upon those things that are inanimate, nor comes upon things that are without reason. In making this assertion he does not recollect, that in baptism the sacramental waters are consecrated by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, and that the bread of the Lord, in which the Body of the Saviour is shown, and which we break for our sanctification, and the sacred cup (which things are placed upon the table of the Church and are so far inanimate), are sanctified through the invocation and the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit." [1]

Nilus (†c. 430 A.D.), in writing to his friend Philip, speaks with no uncertain sound: "A sheet of paper made of papyrus and size is called mere paper; but when it receives the signature of the Emperor, it is named (as is well known) a 'Sacra.' So I pray you consider with regard to the divine mysteries, that before the supplication of the priest and the descent of the Holy Spirit the offered gifts are mere bread and common wine; but after those dread invocations and the overshadowing of the adorable, and life-giving and good Spirit, the elements laid upon the holy table are no longer mere bread and common wine, but the Body and Blood, precious and undefiled, of Christ the God of all, that cleanse from every spot of sin those that partake with reverence and great devotion." [2]

S. Augustine (354–430 A.D.) in his homilies gives us testimony which is in strict accord with that of earlier writers. He speaks of the Word of God as sanctifying the oblations in a manner that recalls to one's mind S. Irenæus [3] and the Liturgy of Serapion.[4] Thus, for example, he says:

"That bread which you see upon the altar, after it has been sanctified by the Word of God, is the Body of Christ.

[1] See Appendix, p. 267.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 267.
[3] See above, p. 37.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 41–43.

That cup, nay what the cup holds, after it has been sanctified by the Word of God, is the Blood of Christ."[1]

Shortly after this he outlines the Anaphora thus:

"You hold the sacraments in their order. First, after prayer, you are admonished to have your heart lifted up. . . . You respond, 'We have it unto the Lord.' . . . The bishop or presbyter who offers continues, 'Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.' . . . And you bear witness, 'It is meet and right' . . . Then after the sanctification of God's sacrifice . . . when the sanctification has been completed, we say the Lord's Prayer."

In another sermon he places the act of consecration upon the part of Christ at the institution in His blessing of the elements. "For He Himself, as His passion was drawing nigh, when He celebrated the Passover with His disciples, blessed the bread He had taken, and said: 'This is My Body which will be given for you.' Likewise the cup which He had blessed He gave saying: 'This is My Blood of the New Testament, which will be poured out for the remission of sins.'"[2]

In another homily he speaks of the consecration in terms that suggest the Epiklesis in Serapion's Liturgy very plainly. "That which you see is bread and wine; but that bread and this wine by the coming of the Word become the Body and Blood of the Word."[3]

In the same sermon he also says:—

"And then [there follow] what things are done in the holy prayers, which you are about to hear, that by the coming of the Word it may become the Body and Blood of Christ. For take away the Word, it is but bread and wine. Add the Word, and actually it is something else. And what is that something else? The Body of Christ and the Blood of Christ. Take away the Word, it is but bread and

[1] *Hom.* 227, *in die Pasch.*, iv. See Appendix, pp. 267–268.
[2] *Serm. ined.*, III., *De Sacr. alt. ad inf.* See Appendix, p. 268.
[3] *Ibid.*, VI. See Appendix, p. 268.

wine. Add the Word, and it will become the sacrament. To this you say, 'Amen.' To say Amen is to give assent. Amen in Latin is translated *Verum.*" The coming of the Word to take a special relation to the elements is here plainly noted, and the Amen at the end of the Prayer of Consecration, *i.e.* the prayer that the Word will come to sanctify the oblation. S. Augustine also speaks of the prayers made when the Eucharist is consecrated, in his Epistle to Paulinus. "I prefer by these words to understand this, that all or nearly all the Church is met together; so that we take as the supplications mentioned, those which we make in the celebration of the sacrament, before that which is on the Lord's table begins to be blessed; prayers, when it is being blessed and sanctified, and broken for distribution; which entire petition almost the whole Church concludes with the Lord's Prayer." [1] Again in his treatise *On the Trinity,* he says: "We call that the Body and Blood of Christ, which taken from the fruits of the earth and consecrated by the mystical prayer, we duly receive to our spiritual health in remembrance of the Lord's passion on our behalf. And this though it is brought to its visible form by the hand of men, is not consecrated to be so great a sacrament, save by the unseen operation of the Spirit of God." This last extract is surely too plain to need comment.[2]

Jerome (345–420 A.D.), in writing to Evangelus, asks, "For since the Apostle clearly teaches that presbyters are the same as bishops, why is the minister of tables and of widows suffered to set himself up arrogantly over those, at whose prayers the Body and Blood of Christ are consecrated?" [3] Again, in his commentary on Zephaniah, he says, "The priests also who serve the Eucharist and distribute the Lord's Blood to His people, act wickedly against the law of Christ in thinking that it is the words of him that prays which makes the Eucharist, and not the life,

[1] See Appendix, pp. 268–269. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 269. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

and that a solemn prayer alone is necessary and not the merits of the priests, of whom it is said, 'Let not the priest in whom is a blemish approach to offer oblations to God.'" [1]

The Greek Jerome (fl. c. 400 A.D.) says, "The Christian is fully persuaded that he partakes not of mere bread and wine, but truly the Body and Blood of the Son of God, when they have been hallowed by the Holy Spirit." [2]

S. Isidore of Pelusium († c. 434 A.D.) asks, "If our God and Saviour incarnate delivered that the Holy Spirit is the complement of the divine Trinity, and that He is numbered with the Father and the Son in the Invocation of holy baptism, as freeing from sins, and that at the mystical table He makes the common bread the very Body of His (*i.e.* Christ's) incarnation; how do you teach, most foolish one, that the Holy Spirit is made or created or of a servant's nature, and not coöriginate and consubstantial with the Almighty and Creating and Royal Essence?" [3] In another letter he says: "Do not despise the divine liturgy, do not contemn the consecration of the fruits. . . . But remembering how the Divine Spirit makes Christ's Blood the first-fruit of this, so use it because of thy weakness." [4]

S. Cyril of Alexandria († 444 A.D.), in commenting on S. Luke xxii. 19, says: "He gives thanks, that is He discourses in the form of a prayer with God the Father, showing that He is the joint giver and approver of the life-giving blessing about to be given to us. For every grace and every perfect gift comes to us from the Father through the Son by the Holy Spirit. And what was done was a pattern to us ourselves of the prayer that ought to be put up, if the grace of the mystical and life-giving oblation is to be presented; which thing indeed we are also wont to do." [5] In other words, Christ's example is the Church's

[1] See Appendix, pp. 269–270.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 270.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 270.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 270.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 270–271.

model in the consecration of the Eucharist. With this we may compare his comment on S. Luke ix. 16, "He looks up to heaven, that is asking for a blessing from above."[1] There is an analogy between the Eucharist and the prototypical miracles of feeding the four thousand and the five thousand, in the prayer put up by Christ to His Father for the end desired in either case. In his comment on S. John vi. 11, we find much the same thought expressed. "So also here it is to be understood that He uttered a blessing over the loaves. It is to be noted that instead of 'He gave thanks,' Matthew said 'He blessed'; but by no means will there be difference of meaning in the versions of the [two] saints. For by way of proof there is Paul using both together and saying that 'All food is good and not to be rejected if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is hallowed by the word of God and prayer.' For that is altogether blessed which is hallowed by prayer in supplication, which prayer we are continually wont to make at the tables."[2] In his comment on S. Matt. xxvi. 26 he says, "At the same time also giving us a pattern, first to give thanks, and so to break the bread and distribute it. Therefore also we, having placed the offered gifts before God, entreat at length for the transformation of the spiritual blessing, that having partaken of them we may be hallowed both bodily and spiritually."[3] In his second œcumenical letter to Nestorius, he gives us another allusion to the Oblation and Invocation in the liturgy. "Having proclaimed the death according to the flesh of the only-begotten Son of God, that is, Jesus Christ and confessing both His reviving from the dead, and His ascension into heaven, we consecrate the bloodless sacrifice in the churches, and thus we come to the mystical blessings, and we are hallowed having become partakers of the holy Flesh and of the precious Blood of Christ the Saviour of us all."[4]

[1] See Appendix, p. 271.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 271.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 271.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

Proclus († c. 447 A.D.) says, "By such prayers they were awaiting the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, in order that by His Divine presence He might make and declare the bread and the wine mixed with water that had been offered for consecration, the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." [1]

Gaudentius of Brescia (fl. c. 420 A.D.) says: "Do not think that to be earthly which is made heavenly by Him Who came upon it and made it His Body and Blood. . . . That is made what it is proclaimed to be by the fire of the Divine Spirit, that you may believe that what you receive is the Body of that heavenly Bread and the Blood of that sacred Vine. For when He offered the consecrated bread and wine to His disciples, thus He said, 'This is My Body, this is My Blood.'" [2]

Theodoret of Cyrus († 458 A.D.), in the second of his theological Dialogues between the Orthodox and the Eclectic Christian, has the following passage: —

"*O.* Tell me now; the mystical symbols which are offered to God by those who act as priests, of what things are they the symbols?

E. Of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

O. Of the real Body or not?

E. Of the real.

O. Very good. For there must be the archetype of the likeness. And this is true, for painters imitate nature and draw the likenesses of visible things.

E. True.

O. If then, the divine mysteries are antitypes of the real Body, therefore also now the Body of the Lord is a Body, not changed into the nature of Godhead, but filled with Divine glory.

E. You have brought in the subject of the divine mysteries at an opportune moment, for from it I will show

[1] See Appendix, p. 272. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

you the change of the Lord's Body into another nature. Answer now to my questions.

O. I will answer.

E. What do you call the offered gift, before the priestly invocation?

O. I must not say openly; for perhaps some of the uninitiated are present.

E. Let the answer be enigmatically given.

O. Food from such and such grains.

E. And how do we name the other symbol?

O. Common also is this name, signifying a kind of drink.

E. But after the consecration, how do you name these?

O. Christ's Body and Christ's Blood.

E. And do you believe that you partake of Christ's Body and Blood?

O. I do believe so.

E. And then the symbols of the Lord's Body and Blood, are one thing before the priestly invocation, but after the invocation are changed and become other; so the Lord's Body after its taking up, is changed into the divine substance.

O. You are caught in the nets you have woven. For after the consecration the mystical symbols do not depart from their own nature; for they remain in their former substance, and figure and form, and they are visible and tangible, such as they were before. But they are regarded as what they are become, and believed to be, and are worshipped as being what they are believed to be."[1]

This witness to the belief of the early ages of the Church regarding the consecration of the Eucharist is of all the more value because of its incidental character. It shows beyond shadow of doubt that not only the orthodox, but also the heretical Christians were entirely at one in teaching and practising, that the elements offered in the Liturgy

[1] See Appendix, pp. 272–273.

were never regarded as consecrated until after the prayer of the Invocation.

To the middle of this same century (fifth) may be assigned the witness of the Anaphora of S. James, so far as that which is common to the text of both the Greek and the Syriac (Monophysite) versions are concerned.[1] The differences are merely verbal, an epithet or phrase added in one or the other without touching the common pattern and meaning and wording, which tell but one story as to consecration by the Epiklesis of the Holy Spirit.[2]

We may then, without misrepresentation of any vital matter, quote from that part of the Greek which corresponds to our Prayer of Consecration, as follows:—

"Lastly Thou didst send into the world Thine only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that He might come and renew and restore Thine image: who coming down from heaven, and being incarnate of the Holy Ghost and Mary the Virgin and Theotokos, and having had His conversation with men, accomplished all the economy for the salvation of our race; and being about to undergo His willing and life-giving death upon the cross, the Sinless for us sinners, in the night wherein He was betrayed, or rather gave Himself up, for the life and salvation of the world,

then the priest taking the bread in his hand says

taking the bread in His holy and spotless and pure and immortal hands, looking up to heaven and dedicating it to Thee His God and Father, He gave thanks, and hallowed, and brake and gave to His holy disciples and apostles saying,

the deacons say

Unto remission of sins and life eternal.

then aloud

Take eat: this is My Body which is broken for you and given for remission of sins.

[1] What is common to both is surely anterior to the schism. Cf. *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. XXIX., No. 58 (January, 1890), p. 372.

[2] Cf. Brightman, *Lit. E. and W.*, Vol. I., pp. 86–89, 97ᵃ, 99.

the people

Amen.

then he takes the cup and says by himself

Likewise after supper taking the cup and mixing it with wine and water, and looking up to heaven, dedicating it to Thee His God and Father, He gave thanks, hallowed, blessed, filled it with the Holy Ghost, and gave to His holy and blessed disciples saying,

then aloud

Drink ye all of this: this is My Blood of the New Covenant, which for you and for many is shed and distributed for remission of sins.

the people

Amen.

Do this in remembrance of Me: for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the death of the Son of Man, and confess His resurrection until He come.

the deacons say

We believe and we confess.

the people

Thy death O Lord we proclaim and Thy resurrection we confess.

the priest subjoins a prayer

Therefore also we sinners remembering His life-giving sufferings, His saving cross and death and burial, His resurrection from the dead the third day, His ascension into heaven, and session at the right hand of Thee, His God and Father, and His glorious and terrible second appearing, when He shall come with glory to judge quick and dead, when He shall render to each according to his works; . . . offer to Thee O Lord this terrible and unbloody sacrifice, beseeching Thee, that Thou wilt not deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to Thy kindness and tender compassion, passing over and blotting out the handwriting that is against us, Thy suppliants, wouldst grant us Thy heavenly and eternal

gifts, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered the heart of man, what Thou O God hast prepared for those who love Thee; and reject not Thy people because of me and of my sins, O Lord and Lover of men

the priest three times

For Thy people and Thy Church supplicate Thee.

the people

Have mercy upon us, O Lord God, Father Almighty.

again the priest says

Have mercy upon us O God Almighty; have mercy upon us O God our Saviour, have mercy upon us after Thy great mercy and send upon us and upon these gifts placed before Thee, Thy all-holy Spirit,

then bowing his head he says

the Lord and Lifegiver, sharer of the throne and of the kingdom with Thee, God and Father, and with Thy only-begotten Son, consubstantial and coeternal, Who spake in the Law and in the Prophets, and in Thy New Covenant, Who came down in the form of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, and abode upon Him, Who came down upon Thy holy apostles in the form of fiery tongues in the upper room of the holy and glorious Sion on the day of the holy pentecost.

and rising, he says by himself

Send down O Lord Thy all-holy Spirit upon us and upon the holy gifts placed before Thee,

aloud

That overshadowing them with His holy and good and glorious presence, He may hallow and make this bread the holy Body of Christ

the people

Amen.

the priest aloud

And this cup the precious Blood of Christ,

the people

Amen.

then standing, he says by himself

That they may be to all those partaking of them, for remission of sins and life eternal, for hallowing of souls and bodies, for bringing forth the fruit of good works," etc.[1]

The Nestorian Liturgy of Addai and Mari, the antiquity of which carries us back to the early part of the fifth century, is most remarkable in that it omits the Narrative of Institution entirely. This goes to show the relation which that recital held in the minds of the early Church to the celebration of the Eucharist. Being employed historically there, it is not absolutely necessary that it be recited at all, and hence probably its omission in this case. At the present time, however, the Narrative of Institution is inserted into this Liturgy in practice. The Invocation contained in this ancient Liturgy is of the implicit variety. It is as follows: "And we also, O my Lord (*repeat three times*), thy weak and frail and miserable servants who are gathered together in thy name, both stand before thee at this time and have received the example which is from thee delivered unto us, rejoicing and praising and exalting and commemorating and celebrating this great and fearful and holy and life-giving and divine mystery of the passion and the death and the burial and the resurrection of our Lord our Saviour Jesus Christ.

the priest rises and elevates his hands and says

AND MAY THERE COME, O MY LORD, thine Holy Spirit and rest upon this offering of thy servants and bless it and hallow it that it be to us, O my Lord, for the pardon of offences and the remission of sins and for the great hope of resurrection from the dead and for new life in the kingdom of heaven with all those who have been well pleasing in thy sight," etc.[2]

The Abyssinian Anaphora of our Lord is of about the same date (early fifth century), and is also a witness worthy

[1] See Appendix, pp. 273–276.

[2] See Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., p. 287.

of our attention. We will quote from the beginning of the Narrative of Institution. "In that night in which they betrayed Him He took bread into His hands holy blessed and without spot, He gave thanks, He blessed, He brake and gave to His disciples, saying: Take, eat, this bread is My body which is broken for you for the forgiveness of sins; and when ye shall have done this, make a commemoration of Me. Likewise also the cup of wine after they had supped, mixing, giving thanks, blessing and sanctifying, Thou didst give to them, Thy true blood which was shed for our sins.

"Now, therefore, O Lord, we remember Thy death and resurrection, we trust in Thee, and offer to Thee bread and the cup, giving thanks to Thee, to Thee alone who [art] the Saviour, God from eternity, since Thou hast commanded us to stand before Thee and to serve Thee as priests. Therefore we also Thy servants, O Lord, ask Thee, O Lord, and beseech Thee to send the Holy Spirit and power upon this bread and this cup, [that] He may make it the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, world without end."[1]

This is somewhat clumsily worded; our Lord Jesus Christ is prayed to instead of the Father, and at the same time His Body and Blood are spoken of in the third person. Nevertheless the testimony presented to us by this crude relic is absolutely at one with all that has preceded it.

Pope Gelasius I. († 496 A.D.), in his *Epistle to Elpidius*, asks, "How shall the heavenly Spirit who has been invoked come for the consecration of the Divine mystery, if the priest also who implores that He be present, is considered guilty as being full of criminal deeds?"[2]

Fulgentius of Ruspe († 533 A.D.) has very interesting and most pertinent witness to give us. He discusses the

[1] See Cooper and Maclean, *The Testament of Our Lord*, Edinburgh, 1902, Appendix, I., p. 247.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 276–277.

question, "Why the Holy Spirit alone is asked for to consecrate the oblation?"

"Now indeed also this question about the sending of the Holy Spirit must be considered by us: why forsooth, if the sacrifice is offered to the whole Trinity, is the sending of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the gift of our oblation asked for, as if in fact, that I may so speak, God the Father Himself, from whom the Spirit proceeds, cannot sanctify the sacrifice offered to Him; or that the Son Himself is unable to sanctify the sacrifice of His Body, which we offer, when He himself sanctified His Body which He offered, that He might redeem us; or that so the Holy Spirit must be sent to consecrate the Church's sacrifice, as though the Father or the Son were wanting to those offering the sacrifice?"[1]

"So also in the sending or overshadowing of the Holy Spirit no local motion on His part is to be understood, but the effecting of our consecration is to be believed."[2]

"Since therefore as we have said the whole Trinity in the unity of Its Godhead naturally remains in Its boundless infinity, and thus is nowhere present locally, so that nevertheless It is nowhere absent, and is so present everywhere in Its entirety, that neither through the parts of the whole creation is by parts divided, nor is shut up within the completeness of the whole creation, — as often as the Holy Spirit is asked from the Father to consecrate the sacrifice; the first rationale of faith and the first caution to be held by all Christians for their own benefit, is that the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit is by no means to be reckoned or thought to be local."[3]

"When moreover does Holy Church (which is the Body of Christ) more fittingly demand the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit than to consecrate the sacrifice of Christ's Body?"[4]

[1] *Ad Mon.* II., 6. See Appendix, p. 277.
[2] *Ibid.* See Appendix, p. 277.
[3] *Ibid.*, 7. See Appendix, p. 277.
[4] *Ibid.*, 10. See Appendix, p. 278.

"Learn therefore what is done in the offering of the sacrifices, that thence you may understand, why the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit is requested there. Forsooth that is fulfilled in the offering of the sacrifices, which the blessed Apostle testifies that the Saviour Himself commanded, saying: 'That the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was betrayed,' etc. (1 Cor. xi. 23–26). And so therefore the sacrifice is offered that the death of the Lord may be proclaimed, and a commemoration be made of Him who laid down His life. . . . Since therefore Christ died for us by reason of His love for us, when in the time of the sacrifice we make commemoration of His death, we demand that love be bestowed upon us through the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit. . . . And so the Holy Spirit sanctifies the sacrifice of the Church, and therefore the Christian people remain in faith and love."[1]

"And so the Holy Spirit, who gives the Church love and preserves it, sanctifies both the sacrifice and baptism by the operation of His Divine power."[2]

These brief extracts show the background of a universal practice, namely, the consecration of the Eucharist by the prayer of the Church to that end, which practice is at once based upon the right belief in the relations of the several Persons of the Trinity to each other, and at the same time serves as a handy proof or illustration of that faith.

Some extracts from a homily ascribed to Cæsarius of Arles (470–542 A.D.) next claim our attention. As they are sometimes erroneously supposed to favour the modern Roman theory of Eucharistic consecration, it is important for us to see just what is said.

"Therefore let all doubtfulness of unbelief depart, since He who is the author of the gift is Himself the witness of the truth. For the invisible priest by His secret power changes visible creatures into the substance of His Body

[1] *Frag.*, xxviii., *Contra Fab.* See Appendix, p. 278.

[2] *Frag.*, xxix., *Ibid.* See Appendix, p. 278.

and Blood, thus saying: 'Take and eat, this is My Body.' And the sanctification having been repeated: 'Take and drink, this is My Blood.' Therefore just as at the behest of the Lord who gave the command, suddenly out of nothingness came into being the heights of heaven, the depths of the sea, the expanses of the land, with equal powerfulness in the spiritual sacraments the Might of the Word gives the command, and the accomplishment of the thing [commanded] complies. Therefore how great and renowned benefits the power of the Divine blessing effects, in what manner it ought not to be a thing novel and impossible to thee, that earthly and transitory things are changed into the substance of Christ, ask thyself who hast been regenerated in Christ." [1]

In this it is plainly intimated that Christ testified by His declaration after His act of consecration that He gave His Body and Blood. His command is still effective to perform the same, through the power of the Divine blessing. Any statement to the effect that Christ Himself consecrated by means of His declaration or that He bade His followers to consecrate by means of a mere repetition of that declaration, is most significantly not made, nor is such a notion even so much as hinted at. A little later in this homily we are told: —

"When the creatures that are to be blessed with the heavenly words are placed upon the altar, before the invocation of the Holy Name the substance there is of bread and wine; after Christ's words however it is the Body and Blood of Christ." [2]

The instrumental means of Eucharistic consecration upon the part of the Church are the heavenly words whereby God's Holy Name is invoked for the hallowing of the oblations. Before this the elements are mere bread and wine. After this they are to be reckoned the Body and Blood of Christ. The writer, however, leaves this to be

[1] See Appendix, pp. 278–279. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

supplied in the mind of his auditor, and leaps back to the original institution, when it was after Christ's words of declaration that the disciples first knew what it was that He proffered them. A fragment of the Gallican Liturgy may be quoted here which serves to illustrate the fact that Cæsarius was in touch with the rest of the Church Catholic in the rationale of Eucharistic consecration. We are given only the last words of the *Post Sanctus* followed by the opening words of the Narrative, which last is not given at length, and then the *Post Pridie*, which unfortunately is not complete. The portion, however, speaks for itself.

"Through our Lord, Who the day before He suffered [etc.] We beseech Thee most merciful Father, through the invocation of Thy name and the pouring out of Thy Holy Spirit upon all creatures, let this creature be made. . . ." [1]

Abruptly as this breaks off, it affords a clue to the position and phraseology of the Invocation of the Holy Name mentioned by the homilist. The witness of the Western non-Roman rites will be considered more fully later.[2]

Pope Gregory the Great († 604 A.D.) in his *Epistle to John of Syracuse* says:

"We say the Lord's Prayer indeed soon after the Prayer [of Consecration], because it was the custom of the Apostles, that at that very prayer alone they consecrated the host of the oblation, and it seemed to me very unfitting, that we should say the Prayer [of Consecration] (which a scholar composed), over the oblation, and that we should not say that very tradition which our Redeemer composed, over His Body and Blood." [3]

It is to be noted that he speaks of the Prayer of Consecration as being said over the oblation, and then inasmuch as the oblation would be consecrated after *that* had been said, the Lord's Prayer is spoken of as being said

[1] See Appendix, p. 279. [2] See Chap. IV., pp. 115–122.
[3] See Appendix, p. 280.

over Christ's Body and Blood. A clear testimony, surely, is this to the Catholic tradition as to the rationale of Eucharistic consecration.

S. Gregory is quoted by his biographer, Paul Winifred, as having said to a woman who doubted that bread which she had made could become the Body of Christ:—

"Our Creator knowing our weaknesses beforehand, by that power, by which He made all things out of nothing, and fashioned for Himself a Body out of the flesh of the ever-virgin by the operation of the Holy Spirit, changes bread and wine mixed with water, their appearance remaining the same, into His own Flesh and Blood at the Catholic prayer, for our salvation, by the hallowing power of His Spirit." [1]

Eusebius of Alexandria (c. 560 A.D.) says, "Many presbyters, being sinners, offer the gifts, and God does not reject them, but consecrates and magnifies the oblations by His Holy Spirit." [2]

Eutychius of Constantinople († 582 A.D.) speaks of the elements at the offertory as "Brought in and not yet consecrated through the high-priestly invocation and the hallowing lightening upon them." [3]

Anastasius Sinaita († 598 or † 610 A.D.) asks: "What are you doing, O man? The priest is offering the unbloody sacrifice on your behalf to the Lord, and do you despise it? The priest is contending on your behalf: as in a reverend court of justice, so standing at the altar, he pleads and urges that the grace of the Holy Spirit overshadow you, and are you not mindful for his salvation?" [4]

John Moschus († 620 A.D.) tells us, in his *Spiritual Meadow*, of an occasion on which a certain Abbot John, afterward bishop of Cæsarea, did not behold the Holy Spirit descend upon the oblations as he was wont to do, and was told by an angel that they had already been con-

[1] See Appendix, pp. 280–281.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 279.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 279–280.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

secrated, by the repetition of the Anaphora over them by a brother who had been sent after them.[1] He also tells another story of a bishop who began the Prayer of Consecration four times but could not finish it, as he did not see the Holy Spirit come down as he was accustomed to do.[2]

The next witness summoned is from the West. S. Isidore of Seville († 638 A.D.) says, "The words of the Lord uttered in the sacred ministration by the priest, namely, 'This is My Body,' are of the substance of the sacrament."[3] That is to say, they are its foundation or charter. For S. Isidore gives us a definition of "sacrifice" which shows the same use in Spain as elsewhere at this time, namely, the consecration of the Eucharist by the prayer in the Liturgy for that purpose. "A sacrifice is so called as being made holy, because by the mystical prayer it is consecrated for a memorial of the Lord's passion on our behalf, whence we call this Christ's Body and Blood, by His command, which, though it is of the fruits of the earth, is sanctified and becomes the sacrament, by the unseen working of the Spirit of God."[4]

When S. Isidore comes to describe the Liturgy we find his testimony most striking. In fact the parallel between his description and that of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, nearly three centuries earlier, is remarkable. It is abundantly

[1] Ch. xxv. See Appendix, p. 281.

[2] Ch. cl. See Appendix, pp. 281–282.

[3] Epistle VII.; see Appendix, p. 283. It is highly probable that this Epistle was writen long after S. Isidore's day, as the controversy regarding leavened and unleavened bread between East and West had not as yet arisen, and this Epistle treats of it as a present issue. As the part quoted is sometimes urged by supporters of the modern Roman theory of consecration, it has been admitted into the text in order to be as fair as possible; yet as a matter of fact it does not say at all what they would wish it to, and even if it were absolutely genuine, it could not be pressed to signify more than it is shown to mean above, in view of the universal liturgical tradition of the Church.

[4] *Originum*, VI. 19. See Appendix, p. 283.

evident that the Invocation is the important factor in the consecration of the Eucharist, and that S. Isidore had never heard of there being more than one use in all Christendom in this particular. It is noteworthy that he does not mention the Narrative of Institution in his description of the "seven prayers of the sacrifice."

"Now the order of the mass and of the prayers by which the sacrifices offered to God are consecrated, was first instituted by S. Peter, and its celebration the whole world performs in one and the same manner.

"The first of these is an address of admonition toward the people that they may be aroused to pray God.

"The second is of invocation to God that He may graciously accept the prayers of the faithful and their oblations.

"The third is poured out for the offerers or for the faithful departed that through the same sacrifice they may attain pardon.

"The fourth is introduced after these for the kiss of peace, that all having been reconciled to each other in love, may be joined together worthily by the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, because Christ's indivisible Body does not admit of dissension of any kind.

"The fifth next is introduced, a preface to the sanctification of the oblation, in which also the whole universe of earthly creatures and heavenly powers is summoned to the praise of God, and Hosanna in the highest is sung, because when a Saviour of the house of David was born, salvation came to the world even to the heights.

"Next after this follows the sixth, the conformation of the sacrament, in order that the oblation, which is offered to God, having been sanctified by the Holy Spirit, may be conformed to Christ's Body and Blood.

"The last of these is the prayer, whereby our Lord taught His disciples to pray, saying: Our Father, who art in heaven. . . . These then are the seven prayers of the

sacrifice commended by evangelical and Apostolic teaching, the rationale of which number seems to have been instituted either on account of the 'seven-characterized' community of holy Church, or on account of the seven-fold Spirit of grace, by whose gift those things which are offered are sanctified." [1]

James of Edessa (640–708 A.D.) in his epistle to Thomas the Presbyter describes the celebration of the Divine Liturgy according to the Syriac Jacobite rite, in considerable detail. It is noteworthy that he makes no mention of the Narrative of Institution, not even when treating of the Anaphora itself, as the following extract will show:—

"And after this the priest says to the people *Lift up your hearts:* the people answer him *Our hearts are with the Lord.* And moreover he cries aloud to them *Let us give thanks unto the Lord:* and they answer him *What thou hast said is meet and right.*

". . . And whereas the priest and the people have meetly accounted it right to give thanks unto the Lord, he says *It is meet and right to praise Thee* and in a few words commemorates the whole scope of the grace of God as touching man and his first creation and his redemption thereafter and as touching the dispensation which Christ wrought in our behalf when he suffered for us in the flesh: for this is the whole kurōbho — that we should commemorate and declare the things which Christ wrought in our behalf.

" He supplicates also for the descent of the Holy Ghost." [2]

In a fragment ascribed to him we are also told: "Then [*i.e.* after the Sanctus] he commemorates the dispensation of the Lord and the giving of the mysteries, and he signs

[1] *De Eccl. Off.*, I., 15. See Appendix, pp. 282–283. This is repeated almost verbatim by the epistle of Etherius and Beatus to Elipandus (P. L., xcvi., 939–940).

[2] Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., pp. 491–492.

over the oblation three crosses and three over the chalice, and as from out the mouth of the Lord he says: 'Do ye be making My memorial,' and they [the people] reply: 'We are mindful.' Then he prays over the people: then most humbly he prays, that the Holy Ghost may come and perfect the Eucharist; then he commemorates those whom he ought." [1]

The Venerable Bede († 735 A.D.) in one of his homilies says, "And so He [Christ] washes us daily from our sins in His Blood, when the memorial of His blessed Passion is renewed, when the creature of bread and wine is transformed into the sacrament of His Flesh and Blood by the ineffable sanctification of the Spirit." [2]

John Damascene (c. 685–765 A.D.) in his *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, writing evidently with S. Chrysostom's statements in mind, elucidates the relation of Christ's words of institution and also that of the Invocation to the consecration of the Eucharist. This passage must be quoted at some length.

"If then the Word of God is living and energizing, and the Lord made all whatsoever He willed: if He said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light, 'Let there be a firmament,' and there was a firmament; if by the Word of the Lord the heavens were established and their whole host by the breath of His mouth; if the heaven and the earth, water and fire and air and the whole adornment of them, and man indeed this most famous living being, were perfected by the Word of the Lord; if the Word of His own will became man and took to Himself flesh of the pure and undefiled blood of the holy ever-virgin One without the aid of seed, can He not make the bread His Body, and the wine and water, His Blood? He said in the beginning, Let the earth bring forth grass, and even until now, when the rain comes it brings forth its proper fruits, urged on and

[1] Quoted by Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis*, etc., pp. 28–29, note 55.

[2] See Appendix, p. 287.

empowered by the divine command. God said, 'This is My Body,' and 'This is My Blood,' and 'This do ye in remembrance of Me,' and by His All-powerful command it comes to pass, until He come; for thus He said, until He come. And the overshadowing power of the Holy Spirit becomes through the Invocation the rain to this new tillage. For as God made all whatsoever He made by the energy of the Holy Spirit, so also now the energy of the Spirit works those things that are above nature and which nothing save only faith can comprehend. 'How shall this be,' said the holy Virgin, 'since I know not a man?' The archangel Gabriel answered, 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.' And now do you ask, how the bread becomes Christ's Body and the wine and water, Christ's Blood? I indeed say to you, The Holy Spirit descends and does these things that are beyond reason and thought. . . . A Body truly united to the Godhead is the Body taken of the holy Virgin; not that the very Body received up comes down from heaven, but that the bread and the wine are changed into God's Body and Blood. If you inquire the manner, how it comes about, it is enough for you to learn that it is through the Holy Spirit, just as also the Lord took upon Himself flesh of the holy Theotokos through the Holy Spirit. And nothing further do we know, but that the Word of God is true, and energizing, and all-powerful, but the manner is unsearchable. Better is it to say this: that just as physically the bread through eating, and the wine and water through drinking, are changed into the body of the one eating and drinking, and do not become a different body from the former one; so the bread of the prothesis and the wine and water, through the Invocation and the descent of the Holy Spirit are supernaturally changed into Christ's Body and Blood, and are not two but one and the same." [1]

In a homily he says: "Let us partake of the Lamb of the

[1] IV., 13. See Appendix, pp. 283–285.

Passover, and let us take of the Fruit of the New Vine, even now the Flesh of God from grain and the Blood of God from wine truly and unspeakably transformed by the Invocation. For He that promised is no deceiver." [1]

The witness of his relative Peter Mansour is to the same effect. "How then has it come to pass? . . . The priest says, like as the angel, That the Holy Spirit descending may hallow and make this bread Christ's holy Body and this cup Christ's precious Blood." [2]

"The Holy Spirit descends, as the angel said to the Virgin asking, 'How shall this be to me, since I know not a man,' 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee. So also at the table the Holy Spirit descends and it becomes the Body of Christ." [3]

The (Iconoclastic) Council of Constantinople (754 A.D.) gives us the following statement regarding the mode of consecration of the Eucharist. "As then the natural Body of Christ is holy, as being deified, so is it plain that that which is by institution His Body, that is, His holy image, is holy, as being deified by the grace of a certain sanctification. For this also the Lord Christ, as we said, brought about, that as He deified the flesh which He took, by a sanctification proper to it according to its nature, from its very union with Him, so also He was pleased that the bread of the Eucharist, as being no untrue image of His natural flesh, being sanctified by the descent of the Holy Spirit, should become a Divine Body, the priest who makes the offering acting as mediator in the transfer from what is common to what is holy." [4]

The second Council of Nicæa (787 A.D.), in whose acts the above extract from the Council of Constantinople of 754 is recorded, makes no complaint against the force of the Invocation therein indicated, and gives us further proof of the universal belief and practice in the matter of Eu-

[1] See Appendix, p. 285.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 285.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 285.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 285–286.

charistic consecration. For as we shall see, in objecting to the use of "image" and "antitype" of the consecrated elements, the appeal is made against this use of the words to the Liturgy of S. Basil, wherein the elements are styled "antitypes" in the Oblation, before the consecration by the Invocation immediately following. While the statement made in the Council of 787 is entirely too sweeping, its evidence, in the matter of how the Greeks understood their own rite in the eighth century, is incontestable. Epiphanius the Deacon voicing the sentiment of the Council says: "It has not been clearly enough pointed out that neither the Lord, nor the Apostles or fathers, ever said that the unbloody sacrifice offered by the priest was an 'image,' but the very Body and Blood. Indeed before the accomplishing of the hallowing, it seemed good to some of the holy fathers that they be called 'antitypes.' Of whom . . . is Basil . . . who . . . as all those engaged in the priestly mysteries know, in the prayer of the holy Anaphora thus speaks: 'Making bold we draw nigh to Thy holy altar, and placing before Thee the antitypes of the Body and Blood of Thy Christ, we beg Thee, and we beseech Thee.' And the rest that follows makes clearer the meaning of the father, that before the hallowing they are called 'antitypes,' but after the hallowing they are rightly spoken of as Christ's Body and Blood, and are, and are believed to be." [1]

The text of the Liturgies of S. Chrysostom and of S. Basil as given by Mr. Brightman from ninth century manuscripts will be found in the Appendix,[2] quoted entire so far as their Anaphoræ are parallel to our Prayer of Consecration.

Nicephorus of Constantinople († 828 A.D.) testifies as follows, "Thus indeed also these [elements] are supernaturally changed into the Body and Blood of Christ by the Invocation of the priest and by the descent of the Holy Spirit: for this power also the priest's prayer possesses." [3]

[1] See Appendix, p. 286.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 287–290.
[3] *Antirr., II., adv. Const. Copron.* See Appendix, p. 286.

And again he says, "What things then also we now offer by way of symbol, the bread I mean and the wine, we believe most unswervingly and confess, that by the priestly Invocation, and by the descent of the All-holy Spirit, they are sacramentally, and invisibly, and truly consecrated to be Christ's Body and Blood." [1]

The Caroline Books presented to the Council of Frankfort, 794 A.D., give us interesting testimony to the fact that the Roman *Canon Missae* was at that time understood to have the same rationale as the Eastern Liturgies. Their witness will be given [2] in the next chapter, which treats more particularly of the Mozarabic, Gallican, and Roman rites.

From Armenia we have a witness of the tenth century explaining the Liturgy as they understood it at that time, Chosroes the Great († c. 972 A.D.). Commenting on the Narrative of Institution, he says: "And here he says: 'He took bread and blessed it.' And 'to bless' is to bring in the Holy Spirit." [3] Commenting on the Invocation ("We adore and beseech and ask Thee, O Lord, send upon us and upon these offered gifts, Thy coeternal and consubstantial Holy Spirit, that He may bless this bread and make it truly the Body of our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ; and that He may bless this cup and make it truly the Blood of our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ, that it may be to those who draw nigh for release from condemnation, for expiation, for remission of sins"),[4] he says: "For the Redeemer was incarnate of the Virgin Mary, the Holy Spirit sent by the Father took flesh in Mary's womb and mingled and united it with the Divine Word, Who born of her was manifested as her son and at the same time as God. The same thing the Holy Spirit does in the church and on the holy altar. He unites the bread taken, with the Son of God, and likewise the chalice,

[1] *Antirr. contra Eus.* See Appendix, p. 287.
[2] See below, pp. 132–133. [3] See Appendix, p. 291.
[4] Cf. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., p. 439.

and they become truly Christ's Body and Blood. This same thing we see and believe to be done, because Christ's word is unerring, Who commanded what He Himself first did, to be done even until His coming again in remembrance of Him. . . . The Holy Spirit . . . Who also does such a wonderful miracle, changing mere bread and wine into the incorruptibility of the Body and Blood of God." [1]

In the modern Armenian Liturgy, the conclusion of the Invocation is repeated nine times, so as to make its meaning unmistakable.[2] This is probably the result of the attack made upon this part of the Liturgy by the Roman Scholastic theologians of the fourteenth century.[3]

Samonas of Gaza (fl. c. 1056 A.D.) tells us that, "The priest places upon the holy table the bread and likewise the wine; and as he prays in the holy Invocation, the Holy Spirit comes down and rests upon the offered gifts, and by the fire of His Godhead, changes the bread and wine into Christ's Body and Blood. . . . The priest then begs of God the Father, seeing that he stands as an ambassador between God and men, that there may be no hindrance to the descent of the All-holy Spirit, but that He will send down again, also, the omnipresent, Divine, perfecting and consecrating Spirit, through whom all things that are called holy in heaven and on earth are hallowed by partaking of His sanctifying grace, to make the offered bread and cup completely a sacrifice, and to make these the very Body and Blood of the Lord Christ." [4]

Theophylact († 1107 A.D.) in the course of his comment on S. John vi. 48–52, says: "For He said not, 'The bread which I will give is an antitype of My Flesh;' but, 'It is My Flesh.' For this bread is transformed by ineffable words through the sacramental blessing and the descent of the Holy Spirit, into the Flesh of the Lord." [5]

[1] See Appendix, pp. 291–292.
[2] See above, p. 87, note 4.
[3] See below, p. 96, and note 1.
[4] See Appendix, pp. 292–293.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 293.

Dionysius bar Salibi († 1171 A.D.), commenting on the Syriac Liturgy of S. James, says of the Narrative of Institution: "Afterwards he utters those words which our Lord spoke in the upper room when He made the sacrament: that by these he may show that He is even now the same, Who consecrates these things placed upon the altar in accord with the Father's will and by the operation of the Spirit through the priest who makes the signs of the cross and utters the words. For it is not he who ministers, but He Who is invoked over the sacraments, who accomplishes the consecration." [1]

Of the Invocation he treats as follows: "The priest bowing down says the Invocation of the Holy Spirit. *Have mercy upon me O God our Father*, etc.[2] At this point we must inquire concerning the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, why here the Holy Spirit descends upon the bread and wine. . . . *That coming down, He may make the bread*, etc., that is, that that Holy Spirit comes down whom I asked the Father to send. The people say, *Amen*, that is, let it be, as thou hast said. Moreover after the priest with bowed head has invoked the Holy Spirit, he raises himself, saying, *That coming down*, etc., and then he signs the host three times with the cross, and the cup three times also; in order to signify that God the Word Himself by the good will of the Father descends and comes down upon the mysteries, and consecrates them through the Holy Spirit: the bread, indeed, to be His Body, and the mixture which is in the cup to make His Blood." [3]

The treatise of Germanus of Constantinople († c. 740 A.D.) inasmuch as it has been interpolated in the eleventh or twelfth century,[4] may be quoted now. "He said, 'This is My Body, this is My Blood.' And He commanded His

[1] See Appendix, p. 294.
[2] Cf. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., pp. 88–89.
[3] See Appendix, p. 294.
[4] See Brightman, *op. cit.*, pp. xciii–xciv.

Apostles and through them His whole Church, to do this: for said He, 'This do ye in remembrance of Me.' He had not commanded to do this, had He not intended to bestow the power to enable to do this. And what is the power? The Holy Spirit. . . . He consecrates the mysteries through the hand and tongue of the priests.

". . . Then next the priest proclaims to God the Father the mysteries of Christ's incarnation, His ineffable birth of the holy Virgin Theotokos, His going to and fro and conversation in the world, His cross, His death, His going down into Hades, His freeing of them that were bound, His rising from the dead after three days, His taking up into the heavens, His seat at the right hand of His God and Father, His second impending glorious coming again, which is for us. . . . And again he calls upon [God] to complete the mystery of His Son, and that the bread and wine be begotten, that is, transformed into the Body and Blood of Christ our God. . . . Whence also the Holy Spirit by the graciousness of the Father, and by the will of the Son, being invisibly present, supplies His Divine energy, and by the hand of the priest, seals and changes and perfects the holy offered gifts into the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." [1]

Theodore of Andida, who wrote after the treatise of Germanus was put in its present form (in either the twelfth or thirteenth century) says, "And after the foregoing prayer," *i.e.* the opening part of the Invocation, "the high priest signs the holy gifts saying, 'And make this bread the true precious Body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and that which is in this cup, the true precious Blood of Thy Christ which was poured out for the life of the world, changing them by Thy Holy Spirit:' which, indeed, we know and believe so to be transformed, as the Invocation signifies." [2]

Most interesting is the *Reply* of Manuel, Great Rhetor of

[1] See Appendix, pp. 294–295. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 295.

the Great Church of Constantinople, to Friar Francis, made about the year 1240. It probably marks the first conflict of the unchanged tradition of the East with the novel teaching that, but recently devised, was flaunted in the face of the Greeks by their Western conquerors. For the Fourth Crusade had been diverted from its purpose, and Constantinople had been plundered in 1204, and a Latin Empire set up.

"Again, concerning the divine and mystical symbols, that is, of the divine Body of the Lord, you say, that the words of the Lord, 'Take eat, and drink,' by themselves change and perfect the elements, and that the divine prayers and holy invocations of the saints have nothing to do with it. But we say that those same divine words of the Lord have a reference to consecration, although the power of the priesthood is through the divine prayers and invocations be it of Saint Chrysostom or the Great Basil. For the divine grace of the priesthood was given to the Apostles by Christ on this account, and from them in succession, and our priests [have received] to consecrate the divine gifts through the Invocation and overshadowing of the Holy Spirit. Thus think we about these things, and we speak according to the orthodox tradition handed down through the fathers from the Apostles." [1]

Nicholas Cabasilas of Thessalonica († 1371 A.D.) treats of this subject at some length in Chaps. XXVII.–XXX. of his *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*. He first expounds the sense of the liturgy and then repels the (then) recent attacks of the Latins. As these chapters are given in full in the Appendix,[2] only brief citations will be made here. Treating of the Anaphora he says: "And so the most honourable and holy things having been arranged, what remains than to turn to the thanksgiving of God the Author of all good things? In other words, imitating the Chief Priest who gave thanks to His God and Father before He

[1] See Appendix, p. 296. [2] *Q.v.*, pp. 296–305.

distributed the sacrament of the communion, he [the priest] also before the perfecting prayer by which he consecrates the holy gifts, makes this thanksgiving to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: 'Let us give thanks to the Lord:' and all assenting and replying, 'It is meet and right,' he offers by himself the thanksgiving to God; both glorifying Him and with angels hymning Him and confessing the largesses of all the good things that come eternally to us from Him. And finally having made mention of the Saviour's dispensation for us, ineffable and passing thought, then he consecrates the precious gifts and the whole sacrifice is completed. And after what manner? Having described that dread supper and how before His passion He gave it to His holy disciples, and how He received the cup, and how He took bread and hallowed the Eucharist, and how He spoke the words whereby He declared the mystery, and having repeated those same words, then he falls to and prays and supplicates, applying those divine words of the only-begotten Son our Saviour even with reference to the offered gifts, and they having received His all-holy and all-powerful Spirit are changed, the bread into His same precious and holy Body, and the wine into His same undefiled and holy Blood.

"And these things having been said, the whole of the holy action is finished and perfected and the gifts hallowed." [1]

In Chap. XXIX. he discusses the objections that were being made in his time by the Roman Scholastic theologians to the Eastern liturgical praxis, *e.g.* that the Eastern view attacks the power of Christ's word, that it betokens self-confidence, and that it makes the mystery depend upon a human prayer. Of course also the Latins alleged S. Chrysostom's homily *On the Treason of Judas*. In reply Cabasilas says: "It is not hard to resolve these objections. And first we must begin with those words

[1] Ch. xxvii. See Appendix, pp. 296–297.

of the divine John upon which they rely. For if this word is also powerful after the manner of the creative word, let us see it. God said, 'Increase and multiply:' what then? After that word do we make no prayer to that end? Have we no need of anything else for the increase? Or, is there need also of marriage and sexual intercourse, and care besides, and without these the race cannot subsist and increase? Therefore even as in that matter for the procreation of children we consider marriage necessary, and after marriage we pray for this same thing, and we think we do not dishonour the creative word, knowing it is the cause of growth of the race, but that the mode is through marriage, through nurture and through other things; so also in this matter we believe that it is the Lord's word which works the mystery, but thus, through the priest, and through his intercession and prayer."[1] Then after showing at some length how God's grace is given to us through the means of prayer, and that to pray for anything is not an act of self-confidence but of trust in God; he says: "Therefore we believe the consecration of the mysteries to be by the prayer of the priest, not that we trust in anything human, but in the power of God. For it is not on account of the man that prays but on account of God that hears; not because that one asked, but because the Truth has promised to give."[2] Toward the close of this chapter, after having added other illustrations of the principle he wished to set forth, he says: "But that the word of the Lord concerning the mysteries, read in the form of a narrative, suffices for the consecration of the gifts, no one of the apostles or the teachers appears to say. But that once spoken by the Lord, in that it was spoken by Him, as the creative word it always has power, even the blessed John says; but that as now read by the priest it has this power on account of being spoken by him, can nowhere be learned, since the

[1] See Appendix, pp. 299–300. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 300–301.

creative word itself does not operate, because in reference to each case it is spoken by some man, but because it was once for all spoken by the Lord." [1]

In Chap. XXX. he very neatly turns the argument against his adversaries by reminding them of the real force of the Invocation in the *Canon Missae, i.e.* the *Supplices te* after the recital of the Narrative of Institution, pointing out that in fact the consecration of the Eucharist is accomplished by the same method in the Latin Church as in the Eastern. "But what altogether gives them the check is that also the Latin Church, in what they appear to offer, after the Lord's word do not refuse to pray on behalf of the gifts. Does it escape them, that they pray, not at once, after the word, and that, not clearly, they ask for consecration and change into the Lord's Body, but they employ other words tending toward that and having the same force? What is the prayer; *Bid that these gifts be carried up by the hand of the Angel unto Thy supercelestial altar.* Now let them say, what is this carrying up of these gifts? Do they pray some change of place for them, from the earth and the lower parts to the heaven, or some increment and change from lower to higher uses?" [2] After pointing out the absurdity of this prayer if the elements are already consecrated, he goes on: "Whence they evidently know them to be yet bread and wine that have not received consecration, and therefore they pray for them, as still needing prayer. . . . This same prayer has no other force for the gifts than their change into the Lord's Body and Blood." [3] Again farther on, he says, "The priest prays that the gifts be carried to this supercelestial altar, that is, that they be consecrated, that they be changed into Christ's supercelestial Body." [4] Cabasilas in conclusion says, "It is evident then, that to despise the prayer on behalf of the gifts made after the Lord's

[1] See Appendix, p. 303.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 303.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 304.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

words is not a peculiarity of the Latin Church as such, but of some few, and they younger men, who disgrace it in other respects, having leisure for nothing else, than to tell and hear some newer thing." [1] These caustic words were only too true, as we shall see, yet this novel opinion ultimately prevailed in the Western Church, casting out the original tradition held from the beginning in the West as well as in the East.

In Chap. XXXI. he answers the question why the priest invokes God the Father for the consecration of the oblation. "But why does not the priest call upon the Son to hallow the gifts, seeing that He is a Priest and Consecrator, as has been said, but calls upon the Father? In order that you may learn that the Saviour has power to consecrate not as Man, but as God, and because of the Divine power which He possesses in common with the Father.

"And this the Lord Himself desiring to show, when He was perfecting the mystery, looked up to heaven, and presented the bread to His Father. Therefore also He appears to accomplish some of His wonders thus, in the form of prayer to God, in order that He may prove that these things are not of His human nature, in accordance with which He had a mother upon earth, but of His Godhead, in accordance with which He had God as His Father." [2]

It is interesting to note that at this time the Roman Church first faulted the Armenian Liturgy because it did not conform to the view of consecration that then prevailed in the West. Although the Armenian Liturgy had been known to the Roman Church since the tenth or eleventh century, no attempt had been made to alter it in the matter of consecration hitherto, for the very simple reason that Scholastic theology had only recently developed the notion that the recitation of our Lord's words was the essential and effective means of consecration. In true Roman fashion a new notion, once fairly started on

[1] See Appendix, p. 305. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 306.

its course, became a standard whereby to criticise all else. To hold that the Eucharist was not consecrated until the Invocation had been said, as the Armenian Church had always done from the beginning, was not condemned by the Roman Church until the year 1341![1] On different occasions when some project of union between the Armenian and the Roman churches was advanced, the errors (!) of the Armenians were discussed (in the years 1080, 1145, 1205, 1307, 1318, 1330, for example), but no complaint was made against the Liturgy (although it had come under censure in other respects) in the question of the force of the Invocation till 1341. At the time when Cabasilas was turning the tables on the Latin critics of the Greek rite, the Latins were engaged in trying to enforce their novel opinion, as a prerequisite to intercommunion, upon the Armenians for the first time.

It is obvious that the attacks made by the Roman Church upon the unbroken liturgical tradition of the Greek and other Eastern Churches served but to strengthen their loyalty to their inheritance, and bring out further writings in its defence. Thus Symeon of Thessalonica († 1429 A.D.), in his *Explanation concerning the Divine Temple . . . and the Divine Mystagogy*, describes the central act of the Liturgy as follows: —

"Then the hierarch hymning the greatest of God's works the incarnation of the Only-begotten, and again the greatest work of His economy on our behalf His death, enters into the anamnesis of the mysteries, and shouts aloud those holy words which the Saviour in His holy action spoke: 'Take, eat, this is My Body,' and, 'Drink ye all of it, this is My Blood,' and so forth. Then having given thanks

[1] Cf. Le Brun, *Explication*, etc., Vol. III., pp. 216–219, Paris, 1726. Cf. Le Brun, *Défense*, etc., pp. 15–18, Paris, 1727. An examination of Councils referred to by Le Brun as contained in the Annals of Baronius (and Raynaldus) and in the records given in Mansi fully bears out the statements made.

on behalf of all, and offering the gifts on behalf of all, he invokes the Divine grace of the Spirit upon himself and upon the offered gifts: through which grace, and having perfected these things with the seal of the cross and with the Invocation of the Spirit, straightway he sees the living Jesus lying before him, the bread and the cup being truly He. For the bread is His Body and that which is in the cup, His Blood." [1] Symeon also devotes a whole section of his treatise to a defence of the Invocation against the Latin impugners thereof. From this we shall give but an extract or two, as the whole will be found in the Appendix.[2] "But here some of those not rightly minded, being in doubt about the Invocation of the Spirit and the consecration of the gifts, and rather opposing themselves to those things delivered by the Saviour and His Apostles, and their successors the divine fathers, stir up strife, asking, how it is that we are not satisfied with the Lord's words only at the consecration of the divine gifts, but trust in our own prayer? These indeed reject rashly and profanely the Invocation of the Divine Spirit, and (alas!) deny His power and energy, which the Saviour both promised to give and granted to His Apostles." [3]

"The coming of the bread and wine to be Christ's Body and Blood, we distinctly believe to be begun by the prayers of the priest, and to be perfected by the sign of the cross and by the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, the Lord's words, 'Take, eat,' and, 'Drink ye all of it,' and, 'This do ye in remembrance of Me,' affording once for all to the Apostles and to the successors to their grace, the power to accomplish this through prayers." [4]

In conclusion he says: "Let the adversaries be convicted also from their own Liturgy. For they pray also that the offered gifts become Christ's Body and Blood, and they bless the gifts, and breathe upon them according

[1] § 86. See Appendix, pp. 306–307.
[2] See § 88, *Ibid.*, pp. 307–311.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 307.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 308–309.

to divine tradition, not being satisfied with the Lord's words alone. Let these innovate in all things. But we, holding fast the traditions which we have received, as the Saviour, through Himself and through His Apostles and the fathers delivered, let us consecrate the mysteries of the dread communion by the Invocation of the Divine Spirit, — through the Lord's utterances, and the priestly prayers,[1] also all the divine acts of consecration, — by prayer of the priest in the divine Invocation, and by the sign of the cross, let us believe that the consecration is received in accord with the divine tradition." [2]

It is abundantly evident to any open-minded reader that the Greeks had maintained a very clear notion of the relation of the Narrative of Institution, and of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit respectively, to the consecration of the Eucharist. The words of Christ declaratory of the gift He gave at the original Institution, and His command to do as He had done, were regarded as a living word of power, analogous to God's creative word. This word is recited historically in the Anaphora, and is brought to present fulfilment by the instrumentality of the prayer of the priest and the operation of the Holy Spirit in answer thereto. When, therefore, we meet with the assertion that at the Council of Florence in 1439 the Greeks acceded entirely to the modern Roman view of Eucharistic consecration, we are not inclined to believe such a statement, and we turn to the records of that assembly to see what really took place.[3] For a whole year and more the Greeks and Latins were assembled at Florence before the Latins raised the question of the "form" of consecration

[1] Sc. "let us perform." [2] See Appendix, p. 311.

[3] Cf. Le Brun, *Défense*, etc., pp. 19–57; *Explication*, etc., Vol. III., pp. 221–222; Crakanthorp, *Defensio Eccl. Angl.*, pp. 495–499; Cosin, *History of Transubstantiation*, *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. IV., p. 135 (228); Brett, *Dissertation* appended to his *Collection of the Principal Liturgies*, pp. 236–247 (London, 1838).

of the Eucharist. Then on June 8, 1439, the eve of the death of the Greek patriarch, the Latins began to find fault with the Invocation, and with its wording, in the Liturgy of the Greeks, and later even demanded the alteration or removal of it. The Greeks resisted these demands, and the Decree of Union contains the following words only in reference to the Eucharist: —

"Moreover in either unleavened or in leavened wheaten bread the Body of Christ is truly consecrated, and the priests are bound to consecrate the Body of the Lord in either, each indeed according to the use of his own Church, be it Western or Eastern." [1]

Inasmuch as the Latins renewed their attacks [2] upon the Greeks immediately after the subscription of this Decree, we should note a few of the utterances made by some of the Greeks in the course of the disputes concerning the consecration of the Eucharist. The first of these was on the 8th of June, and as it is sometimes misrepresented will be given in full: —

"Concerning the Divine Consecration the inquiry was made upon the part of the Latins, How is it that, after Christ's words have been spoken, *Take eat, for this is My Body which is broken for you for remission of sins,* and *Drink ye all of it, for this is My Blood of the New and Eternal Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins;* and the holy gifts have been hallowed through these words, how is it that after these you make a prayer and say, *And make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and that which is in the cup, the precious Blood of Thy Christ, changing them by Thy Holy Spirit.* And this was answered thus. We said that we acknowledge, that through these words the divine bread is hallowed and becomes Christ's Body; but afterward just as you also say, *Command that these gifts be carried up by the hand of the Holy Angel to Thy heavenly altar,* so also we pray to the

[1] See Appendix, p. 312. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 313.

effect that *The Holy Spirit come down upon us, and make in our midst* [1] *this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and that which is in the cup, the precious Blood of Thy Christ,* and *To change them by His Holy Spirit, so that they may be unto those partaking for purification of heart, for remission of sins: that they be not for our judgment or for condemnation.*" [2]

It is manifest that the Greek prelates who made this answer had in mind the argument whereby Cabasilas, about a century before, had turned the tables against the Latins out of the prayer *Supplices te* of the *Canon Missae*.[3] The Greeks regarded the words of Christ with all due reverence, as the ground and warrant for the consecration and as ultimately the cause and source thereof. But after reciting them, the prayer of the Invocation was made in order to bring true, here and now, the declaration of Christ to His Apostles. This explanation is appropriate also to a similar utterance of three of the same prelates on the 10th of June.

"With regard to the question of the mysteries, we acknowledge that they are hallowed through the Lord's words, even if afterward we make invocation; 'Let it become Christ's Body and Blood.'" [4]

It is obvious that the Greeks would not have resisted the attempt to put into the Decree of Union any words that might imply agreement with the Latins upon this point, if they had had any idea of accepting on behalf of the

[1] This is the only reasonable understanding of the words ἐν ἡμῖν. To translate "in us" would be to ascribe to the Greeks a receptionist view of the Eucharistic Presence, and thus to make nonsense of the whole passage. The Greeks considered our Lord's words as the source of the consecration, but deemed the Invocation necessary to the present accomplishment thereof at each celebration of the Eucharist.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 311–312.

[3] See above, pp. 94–95; and Appendix, pp. 303–305.

[4] See Appendix, p. 312.

Eastern Church the Roman notion of consecration by the mere repetition of Christ's words. Nor again would the dispute have been continued after the Decree was signed if the Eastern bishops had given in to the unhistorical subtleties of Scholastic theology in this particular. In fact the Greeks could not see why there should be any dispute about the matter, thinking that the prayer *Supplices te* in the *Canon Missae* was, and was intended to be, the equivalent of the Epiklesis of their own rites. The opinion of the Greeks as to the relation of the words of Christ, and of the Invocation, to the consecration of the Eucharist comes out clearly in the speech of Isidore of Kieff, made on June 20, in answer to the sophistries of Turrecremata.

"This missal which we use has been handed down from Basil and Blessed Chrysostom; we used it moreover before the time of the schism, nor has any alteration been made. Nevertheless the Western Church never said one word about this matter; since forsooth we were agreed and striving for the same end, accordingly we say the same thing. And I say: that we believe that that which accomplishes the mystery is the utterance of the Lord, and we believe that the Lord's word is a cause of the divine gifts. And that word is always repeated by the priest, and the priest undertakes that that word having been repeated may be applied and may be the same word with the Lord's [own] word. And in order that it may be so applied, the Holy Spirit is invoked and the priest supplicates that through the power of the Holy Spirit the boon may be granted, that the word repeated may be rendered as effective as was the word of God. And thus we believe it is made effectual through that prayer of the priest. And I approve, that the Lord's words have a function as seeds, because without a seed fruit cannot be brought forth. So with regard to this word of the Lord. Nevertheless wheresoever the seed falls, it requires other

helps, as a priest, an altar, and prayers. Wherefore we believe that on this point we are agreed with you." [1]

A most interesting light is thrown upon the question before us, in the narrative written by Sylvester Syropulus,[2] who was present not only at the public debates of the Council but also at the semi-private conferences of some of the Greek prelates with the Pope. His words give us a picture of things from the Greek point of view, and show us what was really in the minds of those who defended the Eastern Liturgy and its Epiklesis. Thus he tells us:—

"Then they [the Latins] sought to correct us and to make void the third blessing at the consecration of the unbloody sacrifice, and the Invocation made by the priest. For they were wont to say that the Lord's words hallow these [sacrifices], that is to say, *Take, eat, this is My Body,* and *Drink ye all of this.* Wherefore also the Latins were faulting us, on the ground of our doing mistakenly, in that after the pronunciation of these words of the Lord we pray over, and bless, the holy gifts. And they were seeking to prevent our priests from praying over them, and from blessing them, after saying these words of the Lord." [3]

Syropulus also tells of the resistance of the Greeks to this demand to alter their Liturgies, and how the Latins kept at them, striving by every means to establish the Latin opinion on this matter, and "to compel our priests to consecrate in accordance therewith." [4] And he notes on one occasion the reply of the Metropolitan of Russia (Isidore of Kieff) and the Archbishop of Nicæa (Bessarion), who opposed the Latins in part, and in part agreed with them.

[1] See Appendix, pp. 313–314. Note what follows the quotation. *Principaliter* surely is equivalent to ὡς ἀρχή.

[2] Great Ecclesiarch and Dikaiophylax of the Constantinopolitan Church. He wrote his *History* (or *Memoirs*) c. 1444–1445 A.D.

[3] Section X., Chap. I.; see Appendix, pp. 314–315.

[4] *Ibid.*; see Appendix, p. 315.

"For they said (with other things) also this, that, 'Even as the Divine command once for all spoken by God, namely, *Let the earth bring forth the herb of grass, producing seed after its kind*, from the beginning even until now operates, and will operate until the end of the world; and we are persuaded that as it is the Divine command which empowers the earth to bud and bring forth fruit, but there is need nevertheless of the work of the husbandman, for we see this mightily coöperating with the earth for the production of fruit: so also at this holy sacrifice we say, that those are the words which hallow this, but there are added to that also the prayers and the invocations of the priest in order to the consecration, just as the care of the husbandman contributes to the productiveness of the earth.' When they had said these things, neither were all our representatives pleased, having their gaze fixed upon the purport of the things written in the Divine Liturgies; nor were the Latins much more pleased, having regard to their own prejudice. And therefore they did not agree." [1]

Syropulus also tells us that the speech made by Bessarion (who afterward went over entirely to the Latin Church and was rewarded by being made a Cardinal), after the subscription of the Decree of Union on July 5, was an expression of his own mind alone [2] and did not represent the Greek Church nor commit the other Greeks in the slightest degree. Even so, it is evident that Bessarion did not go as far in his statements as he is represented as doing, in the account prepared and redacted under the direction of Cardinal Julian Cesarini.[3]

The Greeks did not hesitate to avow their belief that the words of Christ as "once for all spoken" are the "source" whence the Church derives Her authority and power to

[1] Section X., Chapter I.; see Appendix, pp. 315–316.
[2] Section X., Chap. VIII.; see Appendix, p. 316.
[3] Cf. Le Brun, *Défense*, etc., pp. 32–39.

consecrate the Eucharist. This conviction the Latins wished to interpret as an admission of *their* contention, but a very little thought is sufficient to make clear, how far removed is the Greek view of the function of the Narrative of Institution in the Liturgy, from that of Latin Scholasticism. The prayer of the priest, at each celebration of the Eucharist, is requisite to the fulfilment of the consecration then and there. Nor have the Eastern Churches ever swerved from their belief in this respect, as we shall see. And no one who has really looked into the facts of the case can assert, with any semblance of honesty, that the Greeks gave their assent to the Scholastic Roman teaching upon the "form" of Eucharistic consecration, at the Council of Florence.

Mark of Ephesus († 1451 A.D.), who was the most stanch defender of the Greek Church at the Council of Florence, has left us a treatise wherein he speaks with the same clearness and pertinency as he did at the Council itself. It is entitled, *That the divine gifts are not consecrated by the utterance of the Lord's words only, but by the subsequent prayer and blessing of the priest in the power of the Holy Spirit.*[1] The position maintained by Mark is this: "We, having received from the holy Apostles and the teachers of the Church that succeeded them, the rationale of the mystical liturgy, find in none of these that the gift of the Eucharist is consecrated and perfected by the Lord's words alone, and changed to the Lord's very Body and Blood: but that these words being spoken in the form of a narrative by way of preface, we, in agreement with all, utter them with reference to the memorial of what was then done and as supplying the power to the offered gifts for the change: and that the subsequent prayer and the blessing of the priest by their energy change the gifts to the very Body and Blood of the Lord."[2] After having quoted those parts of the Liturgy of the Apostolic Con-

[1] See Appendix, pp. 317–321. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

stitutions, and of the Liturgies of S. James, S. Basil, and S. Chrysostom, which correspond to our Prayer of Consecration, he proceeds, "Thus all these harmoniously say the Lord's words by way of preface, and by their means bring us to a remembrance of what was then done, and as supplying the authority for the consecration of the offered gifts: finally, they pray for and invoke the grace of the Holy Spirit, that it coming may apply the things then spoken to these gifts now and consecrate the offered gifts, and change them to the Lord's Body and Blood." [1] In a more condensed form Mark reproduces the arguments of Cabasilas, emphasizing the difference between the words of Christ as originally spoken by Him in the institution of the Eucharist, and as repeated in the form of a narrative by the Church in her act of liturgical obedience to Christ's command, "Do this."

Gabriel of Philadelphia (1541–1616 A.D.) in his apology for the Eastern Church, speaks of the oblation "becoming the Body and Blood of Christ through the invocation of the Holy Spirit"; [2] "through the blessing and prayer of the priest"; [3] and "through the blessing and the power of the prayers." [4]

The tenacity with which the Greek Church has always clung to the primitive tradition in the matter of the consecration of the Eucharist, comes into strong relief again in the seventeenth century. In spite of the tremendous pressure brought to bear upon that much oppressed part of the Catholic Church by the Roman Church, a pressure that accomplished the adoption of Roman phraseology regarding the doctrine of the Eucharist, we nevertheless find the same steadfast adherence to the ancient teaching and practice regarding consecration, as two centuries before at Florence. The *Orthodox Confession* (1643 A.D.), Question 100, asks, "What things are requisite to a

[1] See Appendix, p. 317.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 323.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 323.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 324.

Mystery?", and gives this "Answer. Three things. Proper matter, as is the water in Baptism: the bread and wine in the Eucharist: the oil, and the other things according to the Mystery. Second, the priest or bishop who is regularly ordained. Third, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, and the form of words, with which the priest consecrates the Mystery by the power of the Holy Spirit, with a declared intention of consecrating It." [1] In Question 107 we are asked, "What is to be observed in this Mystery [of the Eucharist]?" "Answer. . . . Fourth, it is requisite, that the priest have this intention at the time when he consecrates the gifts, that the substance of the bread and the substance of the wine is changed into the substance of the true Body and Blood of Christ through the operation of the Holy Spirit, the Invocation of whom he makes at that moment, completing this Mystery, praying and saying: 'Send down thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these offered gifts, and make this bread the precious Body of thy Christ, and that which is in the cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing them by thy Holy Spirit.' After these words the change straightway takes place, and the bread becomes the true Body of Christ, and the wine His true Blood." [2]

A witness so unequivocal needs no comment.

Again in the Fifteenth Decree of the Synod of Jerusalem (1672 A.D.) we read: "We reject as alien to Christian doctrine, [the notion] that the integrity of the Mystery requires the use of the earthly thing; for this is contrary to the Mystery of the Oblation, which having been instituted by the Substantial Word, and having been hallowed by the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, is perfected by the presence of the thing signified, namely, the Body and Blood of Christ." [3]

About the year 1671 the following Declaration was made

[1] See Appendix, pp. 321–322.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 322.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 322.

by some Greeks to the Marquis de Nointel, the French Ambassador at Constantinople, in answer to his request for a statement of belief: "Concerning the dread Mystery of the Eucharist, we believe and confess unswervingly, that the living Body of our Lord Jesus Christ is present invisibly by actual presence in the Mystery: for when, after uttering the Lord's words, the celebrating priest says: 'Make this bread the precious Body of thy Christ, and that which is in the cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing them by the Holy Spirit,' then by the operation of the All-holy Spirit, supernaturally and ineffably the bread is changed actually and truly and really into that very Body of the Saviour, and the wine into His living Blood." [1]

About this same time, in the second half of the seventeenth century, Silvester Medvedeff made an attempt to introduce Roman teaching on this point into the Russian Church. He was thoroughly refuted by Sophronius and Joannicius Lichoudi, and the Russian Church remained firm in adhering to the Eastern and primitive tradition.[2] Whether or not this controversy brought it about is not easy to determine, but the custom prevails in the Russian Church to-day of a prostration after the Invocation,[3] a custom not as yet adopted throughout the Greek Church. Bells are also rung at this moment. Therefore the Oath of a Russian Bishop at his consecration may, most fittingly, be quoted here. "Moreover I believe and hold, that in the Divine Liturgy the consecration of the Body and Blood of Christ is accomplished, as the Eastern and our ancient Russian Doctors teach, by the overshadowing and operation of the Holy Ghost through the episcopal or priestly Invocation, in the words of prayer to God the Father, 'Make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ,'" etc. [4]

[1] See Appendix, p. 323.

[2] See Mouravieff, *A History of the Church of Russia* (English translation), Oxford, 1842, p. 252.

[3] Cf. Maltzew, *Die göttlichen Liturgieen*, Berlin, 1890, p. 229.

[4] See Appendix, p. 323.

Eustratius Argentes († c. 1755–1760 A.D.), a learned Greek physician, in his book *Against Azymes*,[1] discusses the subject of the consecration of the Eucharist at length. In fact he devotes the second part of his work to it alone. As reference has already been made to this treatise in the last chapter, we shall here quote only the two main propositions which the writer advances and defends.

"Since the consecration of the Lord's Supper, which is made by the priests ought to be founded upon the praxis of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who, after the ministration of that most holy symposium, gave command saying, 'Do this:' therefore we intend and purpose in this first postulate to establish and elucidate in what manner our Lord Himself consecrated the bread and the cup of the Eucharist. And from this we may learn, what is easy to comprehend, even the method according to which the priests ought to consecrate: since the consecration on the part of the priests is logically patterned after Christ's act of consecration.

"POSTULATE I

"Our Lord Jesus Christ through thanksgiving, and blessing, and invocation, consecrated and changed the bread and wine into His own Body and Blood, but not through those words, 'This is My Body.' For He spoke these words in order to make clear to the Apostles what that was which He had already blessed." [2]

He ends this postulate as follows: "We conclude therefore that our Lord Jesus Christ through His almighty blessing as God, consecrated and changed the bread and wine into His own Body and Blood: but that being also perfect Man, He joined to His divine blessing thanksgiving

[1] ΣΥΝΤΑΓΜΑ ΚΑΤΑ ΑΖΥΜΩΝ, ΕΙΣ ΤΡΙΑ ΔΙΑΙΡΕΘΕΝ ΤΜΗΜΑΤΑ, Ὧν. . . . Τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, ΠΕΡΙ ΑΓΙΑΣΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΥ. *Συντεθὲν παρὰ τοῦ φιλοσοφωτάτου, καὶ ἐν ἰατροῖς ἀρίστου* ΜΑΚΑΡΙΤΟΥ ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΟΥ *Τοὐπίκλην* ΑΡΓΕΝΤΗ ΤΟΥ ΧΙΟΥ. . . . ΕΝ ΝΑΥΠΛΙΩ. . . . 1845.

[2] See Appendix, p. 324.

and prayers and invocations to his Heavenly Father. . . . Then He proffered these things to His Apostles to eat and drink, explaining to them also what it was He gave them, namely His Body and His Blood.

"Therefore those words are explanatory only of the Mystery, but not also consecratory, for the change takes place through the blessing and the thanksgiving and the invocation. Q.E.D." [1]

His second postulate is as follows: "The priests of the Christians ought to consecrate the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper through thanksgiving and blessing and invocation, not through the words, 'This is My Body': and they ought to utter these words not with reference to consecrating, but to show that they purpose to perform what Christ did: and besides they ought to explain to those partaking what is being given them, even as Christ also explained the same to His Apostles.

"Since it has been proved most clearly and exactly, that our Lord Jesus through blessing and thanksgiving and invocation of His heavenly Father consecrated the bread and cup of the Lord's Supper, and changed them into His own Body and Blood, and then explained and made clear to His disciples, what it was that had been blessed and was being given to them: and finally laid the command upon them to do the same that He had done, saying, 'Do this': it becomes evident that the priests of the Christians ought to imitate Him, and to do without deviation what He did." [2]

He concludes this postulate thus, "We conclude then that the priests of the Christians ought to consecrate the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper not through those words, 'This is My Body': but through prayer, and thanksgiving, and blessing, and invocation of the Divine Name. Q.E.D." [3]

It remains for us to note but two or three more witnesses

[1] See Appendix, pp. 324–325. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 326–327.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 330.

to the maintenance of the primitive tradition unbroken from the beginning until to-day by the Eastern Church.

In a *Handbook treating of the Seven Mysteries of the Holy . . . Eastern Church*, published at Athens in 1832, we read: "In many ways the Latins break the law in the matter of this most divine Mystery, but especially in these three. . . . Second. That also they think that the consecration of the offered gifts is not brought about through the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, but through the Lord's words, 'Take, eat,' etc., which are spoken by the priest in the form of a narrative." [1]

In the *Longer Catechism* of the Russian Church, promulgated by the Holy Synod in 1839,[2] we read:

"*Q.* What is the name for that part of the Liturgy, in which the Sacrament itself is celebrated and consecrated?

"*A.* The Liturgy of the faithful; because the faithful only, that is, the baptized, have a right to be present at this Service.

"*Q.* What is the most essential act in this part of the Liturgy?

"*A.* The utterance of the words which Jesus Christ spake in instituting the Sacrament; Take, eat, this is My Body; Drink ye all of it, for this is My Blood of the New Testament; Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28; And after this the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the blessing the gifts, that is, the bread and wine,[3] which have been offered.

"*Q.* Why is this [4] so essential?

[1] See Appendix, p. 330. Cf. Argentes' *dicta* in regard to the significance of "bless" and "blessing" (Part II., Post. 1, Sup. II., Chap. 3, and Chap. 6. See Appendix, pp. 325–326.

[2] See *The Teaching of the Russian Church*, by the Rev. A. C. Headlam, London, 1897, pp. 6–7.

[3] N.B. The elements are regarded as mere bread and wine after the Narrative, and after the Oblation.

[4] *I.e.* the Invocation and blessing of the gifts. Cf. *The Orthodox Confession*, question 107, quoted above, p. 106. Cf. also the Greek Catechism of Nicholas Persides, Athens, 1903, quoted on p. 334 in the Appendix.

"*A.* Because at the moment of this act, the bread and wine [1] are changed, or transubstantiated, into the very Body of Christ, and into the very Blood of Christ."

In the present *Euchologion* of the Greek Church we find the following foot-note with reference to the deacon's pointing to the elements during the recitation of the Narrative of Institution by the priest: "It is to be noted, that, the demonstrative pronominal sentence, 'This is My Body,' and again, 'This is My Blood,' is not uttered with reference to the offered gifts, but with reference to those which Jesus then took in His own hands, and blessed and gave to His disciples: and here those words of the Lord are repeated in narrative form, and consequently this pointing is superfluous and rather opposed to the right opinion of the Eastern Church of Christ." [2]

How the Greeks understand their own Liturgy to-day may be readily seen from a commentary on the Liturgy, published in 1869 at Athens. We may quote from it briefly as follows: —

"He speaks aloud the words through which the Saviour instituted the Mystery, 'Take, eat . . .' that we may say the Amen and therewith signify that by the power of the Saviour's institution we accomplish the mystical Supper and invoke the Holy Spirit for the hallowing of the precious gifts. . . . But also when the most glorious moment of the hallowing of the gifts draws near through the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, then at the utterance, 'Thine own of Thine own' . . . the choir briefly and the people with them, sing the 'We hymn Thee,' etc., which is the Thanksgiving in brief, which the priest said secretly. Because the same begins at the 'It is meet and right to hymn Thee, to bless Thee, to praise Thee, to thank Thee, to worship Thee,' etc. But the 'We beseech Thee' of the 'We

[1] N.B. The elements are *still* regarded as mere bread and wine until after the Invocation.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 330–331.

hymn Thee' corresponds in many ways to the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, which is made while the 'We hymn Thee' is sung." [1]

Again slightly more at length: "The celebrant paraphrasing the triumphal hymn follows out the thanksgiving, giving thanks before God also on account of His great beneficence in sending His only-begotten Son for our salvation. And he narrates briefly, how fulfilling the work of our salvation, He instituted His mystical Supper, and says aloud the sentences, 'Take, eat,' 'Drink ye all of it.' To these the choir answers 'Amen,' so be it: so be it, they say, that now also we may be deemed worthy of the mystical Supper and that the Bread may be changed into the Lord's Body and the Wine into His Blood.

"After this the celebrant says secretly, 'Remembering therefore His saving commandment and all the things wrought on our behalf, ...' and he speaks aloud, lifting the Paten and the Cup together with crossed hands, 'Thine own of Thine own we offer to Thee on account of all and for all,' so that the people also through the choir may sing in brief the Thanksgiving, 'We hymn Thee, we bless Thee, we thank Thee, Lord, and we beseech Thee, O our God.' And while this thanksgiving is being sung, the most important moment of the Liturgy is at hand, the hallowing of the precious gifts through the Invocation: because the priest then begs and invokes and implores God to 'Send down upon us and upon the offered gifts His Holy Spirit, and make this bread the precious Body of Christ, and that which is in the cup the precious Blood of Christ.' And as he says, 'And make this bread,' he seals the bread with the blessing of the sign of the cross (through which all the Mysteries are hallowed according to primitive tradition, as the great Basil notes): and as he says, 'That which is in the cup,' he signs the Cup in the same manner; and as he says, 'Changing them by

[1] See Appendix, p. 331.

Thy Holy Spirit,' he signs both, the deacon responding 'Amen' each time, which he repeats thrice at the last." [1]

It may not be amiss also to quote from the *Holy Catechism* of D. N. Bernardakis, published and used with the approval of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Thus under the question: "By whom and in what manner is the Eucharist fulfilled [consecrated]?" we are told: ". . . For the fulfilling of this Mystery the priest takes wine, red and pure, and pours it with water into the holy cup, and leavened bread of wheat [or barley], and after that in the Liturgy he has invoked the Holy Spirit and has blessed the holy gifts, the bread is changed into the undefiled Body, and the wine with water, into the precious Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." [2]

Again in answer to the question: "In what way do the heterodox Churches differ in regard to the Mystery of the Eucharist?" we are told: ". . . Another innovation of the Latin Church concerning this Mystery is that, in the holy action the priest does not call upon God to hallow the bread and the wine, nor does he bless them, as the Catholic Church has received from the beginning and practises, but only pronounces simply and, so to speak, historically the words of the Lord that are in the gospels: 'This is My Body,' and 'This is My Blood,' and believes that through these the holy gifts, though only presented, have been hallowed and transformed. The enormity of this error any one perceives as soon as he considers that this method of hallowing is opposed not only to the ancient and unbroken tradition and practice of the Catholic Church, as we have said before, but [is opposed] also to the essential and proper definition itself of the consecration of every Mystery in general, that the priest ought to pray, invoking the Divine grace from above and blessing the material [part] in the Mystery." [3]

[1] See Appendix, pp. 331–332.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 332–333.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 333.

In concluding this survey of the patristic and liturgical witness to the consecration of the Eucharist by God in answer to the prayer of the Church to that end in the liturgical Invocation of the Holy Ghost, and in noting how loyal the whole Eastern Church has ever been to this primitive teaching and practice, we cannot do better than to quote the tenth chapter of the *Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople to the Papal Encyclical on Union*, put forth in 1895: —

"The one holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils held that the precious gifts are consecrated after the prayer of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost by the blessing of the priest, as the ancient rituals of Rome and Gaul testify; nevertheless afterwards the Papal Church made an innovation in this also, by arbitrarily accepting the consecration of the precious gifts as taking place along with the utterance of the Lord's words: 'Take, eat; this is My Body:' and 'Drink, ye all of it; for this is My Blood.'"[1]

[1] See Appendix, pp. 333–334.

CHAPTER IV

THE WITNESS OF THE ROMAN *CANON MISSAE*

It will now be our task to examine into the structure and the rationale of the Roman *Canon Missae*, in order to see if it originally differed in any marked degree from the Eastern Anaphoræ in the matter of the consecration of the Eucharist. In other words, has what is sometimes called "the Western theory of consecration" any root in primitive antiquity, or is it a later development, taking its rise after the severance of East and West? Since the eighth century the Roman rite has ruled supreme over Western continental Christendom, although for three centuries longer the Spanish rite struggled ineffectually against it. Was the *Canon Missae* always understood as it is to-day, or has its meaning been perverted since its sway became so extended. In other words, has Rome mistaken the rationale of her Prayer of Consecration, and in accordance with so much of her policy in other matters, not only refused to correct her error, but also endeavoured to force it upon others?[1]

S. Isidore of Seville, writing at the beginning of the seventh century, tells us that the Church everywhere celebrated the Eucharist in the same manner,[2] and by his description of the Liturgy,[3] and by his definition

[1] See above, pp. 95–104 (Chap. III.), in reference to the treatment of the Armenians, and also in regard to the attempts made at the Council of Florence to force an acquiescence from the Greeks to the Roman theory of consecration.

[2] See above, p. 81, and Appendix, p. 282.

[3] See above, pp. 81–82, and Appendix, pp. 282–283.

of "sacrifice,"[1] shows clearly that he regarded the Invocation to be the instrumental means of Eucharistic consecration, as plainly did S. Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century. Therefore, before touching upon the main question now before us, it will be necessary for us to turn our attention to the remnants of the non-Roman rites which are to be found. So thorough was the rooting up of these Western non-Roman uses that only fragments of Gallican *missae* remain.[2] Yet those which are known to exist bear strong affirmative testimony to S. Isidore's statement and show beyond the shadow of a doubt that the ancient Gallican rite was entirely in accord with the Eastern Churches in its notion and practice of Eucharistic consecration.

After the recital of the Narrative of Institution, the priest said a prayer[3] (called *Post Secreta* or *Post Mysterium*), which corresponded to the *two* paragraphs of our Prayer of Consecration, namely, *The Oblation* and *The Invocation;* that is to say, he commemorated our Lord's sacrifice and offered the elements in memorial of Him, and then besought God to accept and bless the bread and wine. Usually the Holy Spirit is mentioned. A few examples follow:—

"Remembering therefore, and keeping the commands of the Only-begotten, we beseech Thee, O Father Almighty, that upon these creatures laid upon Thy altar Thou pour the Spirit of sanctification, so that by the transfusion of the heavenly and invisible sacrament, this bread having

[1] See above, p. 80, and Appendix, p. 283.

[2] For an account of these, see Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, etc., pp. 151–154. The so-called *Gallican Sacramentary* (cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 158–160) gives us an example of the process whereby the Roman rite replaced the Gallican. The invariable *Canon Missae* has displaced the variable Gallican *Post Sanctus* and *Post Pridie* prayers.

[3] Several examples of this will be found in the Appendix, pp. 334–339, in addition to those translated here.

been changed into the Flesh and the cup into the Blood, there may be grace to all, healing to those receiving." [1]

"He added this command, that as often as His Body and Blood should be received, commemoration should be made of the Lord's Passion. And we doing this ever proclaim the glory of Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord and God. We beseech Thee to bless this sacrifice with Thy blessing, and to suffuse it with the dew of the Holy Ghost, so that to all receiving it may be a Eucharist pure, true, valid, through Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord and God, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and with the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen." [2]

"Keeping these commands and precepts, O Lord, we humbly pray, that Thou vouchsafe to receive and bless and sanctify this sacrifice: so that it become for us a valid Eucharist, in Thy name and in the name of Thy Son and of the Holy Ghost, unto transformation of the Body and Blood of our Lord God, Jesus Christ Thy Only-begotten; by whom Thou dost create all things, having created dost bless them, having blessed them dost sanctify them, having sanctified them dost bestow them, O God, who in perfect Trinity livest and reignest, world without end." [3]

Occasionally we find the Invocation preceding [4] the Narrative of Institution, for no exact moment of consecration having been fixed upon in early times, the Eucharistic prayer was often loose in its construction; always

[1] *Missale Richenovense*, p. 21. See Appendix, pp. 334–335.

[2] *Missale Richenovense*, pp. 26–27. See Appendix, p. 335.

[3] *Missale Gothicum, Post Secreta* for the feast of the Circumcision. See Appendix, pp. 335–336.

[4] Cf. the Sacramentary of Serapion. See above, p. 42, and Appendix, p. 252. Cf. also the Liturgy of S. Mark (Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 132); the Liturgy of the Coptic Jacobites (Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 176); and a recently published Egyptian Mass (*Dictionnaire d' Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, col. 1907). The Egyptian rite seems to have had a preliminary Invocation before the Narrative of Institution as well as the normal Epiklesis after the Oblation.

containing, however, the two primal factors, derived from the original institution, of thankful commemoration of God's mercies, and of impetration of the Divine blessing upon the oblations of bread and wine. The following instance indicates plainly that the Narrative *Qui pridie* was regarded as an epexegetical quotation: —

"By Thy command, Lord, all things were made in heaven and earth, in sea and in all deeps. To Thee patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and all the Saints give thanks. And we also doing this, beseech Thee that Thou gladly receive these spiritual oblations and pure offerings. We pray Thee to bless this sacrifice with Thy blessing, and suffuse it with the dew of Thy Holy Ghost; that it may be for all a valid Eucharist. Through Christ our Lord. Who the day before." [1]

The Mozarabic rite is preserved for us in a few manuscripts dating from the period of its overthrow as the national rite of Spain,[2] and in the Mozarabic Missal edited under the auspices of Cardinal Ximenes in 1500. This last bears the marks of the era in which it was published, yet at the same time there is embedded in it manifold evidence of the old rationale of Eucharistic consecration as held in the Churches of the peninsula. The late interpretation of the Roman *Canon Missae* has been read into it as far as may be, the rubrics of the Romano-toledan rite having been introduced,[3] and a brief fixed Invocation placed between the *Post Sanctus* and the Narrative of Institution. This last runs as follows: —

"Be present, be present, Jesus, Thou good High priest in our midst, like as Thou wast among Thy disciples:

[1] *Missale Gothicum*, *Post Sanctus* for the Vigil of Easter. See Appendix, p. 337.

[2] *Le Liber Ordinum*, . . . publié pour la première fois . . . par Dom M. Férotin, Paris, 1904, Introduction, p. xi. *seq.* Cf. also British Museum (Additional) MSS. 30,844; 30,845; 30,846.

[3] Cf. *Liber Ordinum*, p. xiv.

sanctify this oblation, that having been sanctified by the hands of Thy holy Angel we may receive them, Thou holy Lord and Redeemer eternal." [1]

This Missal is most interesting in that it contains so great an abundance of material in a fossilized state.[2] Even as it is, revised in a definite direction for publication, it gives us many examples of beautiful *Post Pridie* prayers parallel to the Eastern Invocation. Indeed, you will not find many *Post Pridie* prayers in the whole Missal which do not contain a definite, though brief, petition for the hallowing of the oblations of bread and wine.[3] An example or two must suffice.

"This doing, Holy Father, we set forth before Thee the death of Thy Only-begotten, by which we are redeemed, as He hath commanded until His coming again. We proclaim that He died for us: do Thou bestow on us the honour of dying with Him. We believe that He rose again: do Thou grant that we may be delivered from our

[1] See Appendix, p. 339.

[2] The process of adaptation to the then dominant theory of consecration was not completed. The insertion of *Adesto* before the Narrative of Institution and the introduction of the Romano-toledan rubrics have left untouched the phraseology of the Invocations found in so many of the *Post Pridie* prayers, as well as some that are found in prayers *Post Sanctus*, and even in the *Illations*. In a few places, possibly, alterations have been made in the interest of the Roman theory of consecration, but not often enough to impair the witness of the Missal as a whole to the primitive belief on this point. Crude though the Mozarabic Anaphoræ often are, and diffuse, they show us how the two chief elements of the Eucharistic Prayer, viz., *praise*, and *petition for blessing* upon the oblations of bread and wine, were present to the minds of those who framed the manifold examples contained in the Mozarabic Missal. (Cf. *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXIII., No. 126, Jany. 1907, pp. 315–322.) Several examples, in addition to those cited in the text, are given in the Appendix, pp. 340–358.

[3] Cf. Watterich, *Der Konsekrationsmoment*, etc., pp. 234–235. Out of 151 *Post Pridie* prayers, 138 have a more or less distinctly expressed petition for the consecration of the elements.

daily falls. We believe and we proclaim that He will come again to judgment: do Thou grant us so to live, that we may deserve to hold His dread coming again, as a blessing. And we humbly beseech Thee to accept and bless this oblation also, as Thou didst accept the gifts of Thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our forefather Abraham, and that which Thy high priest Melchizedek offered. Here, I beseech Thee, let Thy blessing invisibly descend as of old time it descended visibly upon the sacrifices of our fathers. Let the sweet-smelling savour ascend in the sight of Thy divine Majesty from this Thy glorious altar by the hands of Thy Angel, and let Thy Holy Spirit come down upon these mysteries, that He may sanctify the oblations and the vows, both of those who offer and of those who stand by; that whosoever of us partake of this Body may receive a medicine for our souls, to heal the wounds of our hearts, to drive out all vain thoughts from the mind, to root out hatred and earthly lusts, to implant undying charity which covereth the multitude of sins. So that indeed this precious Blood of Thy Son our Lord may so wash away our sins when we drink thereof, as once when poured out it redeemed us." [1]

"We make, O Lord, the memorial of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who hath redeemed us by His death, and exalted us by His resurrection. Who to-day came in to His disciples by closed doors, and to one of them in doubt offered Himself to be handled by bodily touch. Wherefore, through Him, O God our Father, we beseech Thee to sanctify these oblations by that Spirit by whom Thou didst once breathe upon Thy believing disciples. And thus may we by communion of this sacrifice receive the gift of holiness, as they obtained the commission of preaching when Thou didst breathe upon them." [2]

"Openly have we proclaimed, nor shall we ever hold our

[1] *Post Pridie* for Easter Monday. See Appendix, p. 344.

[2] *Post Pridie* for Low Sunday. See Appendix, p. 345.

peace, that Thou, O Christ, didst suffer for the redemption of us miserable sinners, that Thou didst rise again for the salvation of the faithful, that Thou didst go up to heaven for the strength of those who strive, that Thou wilt come to be the judge of quick and dead. And knowing this, O Lord, in order that that dread day may draw nigh more gently by Thy intercession, we offer these gifts. And that when we receive them they may avail us for salvation, let Thy Holy Spirit come upon them, Who in likeness of flame took up the offerings of Manoah. Let Thy Holy Spirit come and quicken them, Who by the heat of fire consumed the whole burnt offering of Elijah the prophet. Let Thy Holy Spirit come and quicken them, Who by the dividing of fiery tongues visited the hearts of Thy Apostles. So that when received in our hearts they may afford us salvation, both now and forever." [1]

The publication of the *Liber Ordinum* by Dom Férotin places within reach of the student some of the manuscript remains of the old Spanish rite. From this we see clearly that in the eleventh century the *Conformatio sacramenti* was regarded (as formerly) as consisting of the *Post Sanctus*, the *Qui pridie*, and the *Post Pridie;* and also that the fixed Invocation inserted before the Narrative of Institution in the Missal as published by Cardinal Ximenes had no place there in the earlier and untampered rite.[2] A study of any of the manuscript remnants of the Mozarabic rite can hardly do aught but increase the conviction of the student that Spain was of old at one with the whole East, in the manner of consecrating the Eucharist. The fragments of the tenth century Mozarabic Missals in the British Museum [3] alone afford evidence of the fact that

[1] *Post Pridie* for Ascension Day. See Appendix, p. 345.

[2] *Liber Ordinum*, cols. 237–239. Appendix, pp. 354–355. Cf. *Paléographie Musicale*, Vol. V., pp. 55–56, note 9; and *Mozarabic. Missal*, P. L., lxxxv., cols. 549–550, note *e*.

[3] Additional MSS. 30,844; 30,845; 30,846.

the Invocation was not always written out in full any more than was the Narrative and that the priest supplied it from memory where necessary.[1] One of the *Post Pridie* prayers given above[2] is contained twice, in one place complete, in the other case stopping abruptly after the words, "And that when we receive them they may avail us for salvation."[3] Obviously the celebrant would finish out the rest from memory.

The evidence of Gallican and of Spanish rites tells the same story as that of all the East. The consecration of the Christian sacrifice was made by the "mystical prayer," that the oblation of the two fruits of the earth in memorial of Christ's passion might be sanctified by the unseen working of the Holy Ghost, and be conformed to Christ's Body and Blood.[4] One Eucharist, one rationale of the consecration thereof in East and West, — was Rome alone an exception to this unity?

Let us then turn our attention to the *Canon Missae* and examine it in the various stages of its history. First, its text[5] and the meaning of its parts and their interrelation, laying aside the rubrics that accompany it

[1] Cf. John Johnson, *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, etc., Part II., Chap. II., § II., *Works, A.C.L.*, Vol. II., pp. 175–176, note *o*, esp. "(2) . . . . It is reasonable to believe, that the Priests in that age could as readily supply the defect of the Oblation and Prayer for the benediction of the Spirit, as they could that of the Words of Institution; and since they all follow one after the other, therefore the same *item*, or 'etc.' might serve to remind the Priest of all three."

[2] *Post Pridie* for Ascension Day. See Appendix, p. 345.

[3] *Ibid.*, especially "N. B." following.

[4] Cf. S. Isidore of Seville, quoted above pp. 80–81; and Appendix, pp. 282–283.

[5] The text in the Appendix (pp. 359–361) is from the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, the earliest known MS. which contains it. Its paragraphs are lettered, and each word is numbered, in order that it may thus the more easily serve as a standard whereby textual variations can be noted, and the position of rubrics readily be seen.

to-day, must be considered. Then the ceremonial that was used in connection with it, in the eighth century, for example, the earlier rubrics, and their significance claim our notice. Thus doing we shall find it originally *en rapport* with the old Gallican and Mozarabic rites and with those of the East as well, and then from the evidence that comes to hand we can trace the steps whereby the differentiation of the Roman rite from the unity of Christendom[1] was accomplished and stereotyped.

Translated into English, we shall see not only its plain meaning, but also its simplicity and beauty, in spite of its somewhat disjointed workmanship.[2] The text followed in the translation is that of the present Roman Missal, which differs but slightly from that of the earliest exemplar known to us.[3]

A. "Therefore, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord, we humbly pray and beseech Thee, that Thou wouldst accept and bless these ✠ gifts, these ✠ presents, these ✠ holy undefiled sacrifices, which we offer unto Thee, especially for Thy holy Catholic Church: which do Thou vouchsafe to pacify, guard, unite, and govern throughout the whole world, together with Thy servant N. our Pope; N. our Bishop; [4] and all orthodox believers and professors of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith.[4]

[1] Note also an Ambrosian *Post Pridie* for Maundy Thursday, p. 358. This is still used in the Ambrosian rite, but is now merely an insertion between *Nobis quoque* and the concluding doxology of the *Canon Missae* on that day.

[2] See an article by the Rev. Edward Burbidge on the *Origin of the Roman Canon* in *The Guardian* for March 24, 1897, p. 471; also *Paléographie Musicale*, Vol. V., pp. 55–96. Cf. *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, Frere's revised "Procter," London, 1901, pp. 430–449.

[3] The crosses are given in the text according to the present Roman use.

[4-4] This clause is not found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*.

B. "Remember, O Lord, Thy servants and handmaids, N. and N., and all here present, whose faith and devotion are known to Thee: [1]for whom we offer, or[1] who offer to Thee this sacrifice of praise, for themselves and for all their own, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of salvation and well-being, and who pay their vows unto Thee, eternal God, living and true.

C. "In communion with and honouring the memory, especially of the glorious ever Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ; and also of Thy blessed Apostles and Martyrs, Peter and Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon and Thaddeus, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Xystus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian, and all Thy Saints; by whose merits and prayers do Thou grant that in all things we may be defended by the aid of Thy protection. Through the same Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

D. "This oblation, therefore, of our service, and that of Thy whole family, we beseech Thee, O Lord, graciously to accept; [2]and to order our days in Thy peace, and to command that we be delivered from eternal damnation, and be numbered in the flock of Thine elect.[2] Through Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

E. "And this oblation, we beseech Thee, O God, do Thou vouchsafe to make in all things bless✠ed, approv✠ed, ratifi✠ed, reasonable, and acceptable; that it may become for us the Body ✠ and Blood ✠ of Thy most dearly beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.

F. "Who, the day before He suffered, took bread into His holy and venerable hands, and with eyes lifted up to heaven, unto Thee, O God, His Almighty Father, giving thanks to Thee, He bless✠ed, brake, and gave to His

[1-1] This clause is not found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary.*

[2-2] This clause is said to have been added by Pope Gregory the Great.

disciples, saying: Take, and eat ye all of this. For this is My Body. Likewise, after supper, taking also this excellent cup into His holy and venerable hands: in like manner giving thanks to Thee, He bless✠ed, and gave to His disciples, saying: Take, and drink ye all of it. For this is the Cup of My Blood of the New and eternal Testament: the Mystery of Faith; which shall be shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins. As often as ye do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me.

G. "Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, and likewise Thy holy people, having in remembrance [1] the blessed Passion of the same Christ Thy Son, our Lord, together with His Resurrection from the dead, and also His glorious Ascension into heaven, do offer unto Thy excellent Majesty, of Thy gifts and bounties, a pure✠offering, a holy✠offering, a spotless✠offering, the holy✠bread of eternal life, and the cup✠of everlasting salvation.

H. "Upon which do Thou vouchsafe to look with favourable and gracious countenance, as Thou didst vouchsafe to accept the gifts of Thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our forefather Abraham, and that which Thy high priest Melchizedek offered unto Thee, [2] a holy sacrifice, a spotless offering.[2]

I. "We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be carried up by the hands of Thy holy [3] Angel to Thine altar on high, in the sight of Thy divine Majesty, that as many of us as shall, from this participation of the altar, receive the most sacred Body✠and Blood✠ of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace. Through the same Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

J. "Remember, O Lord, Thy servants and handmaids, N. and N., who have gone before us with the sign of faith,

[1] Some MSS. insert here, "the honoured Nativity and."

[2-2] Pope Leo I. is said to have added these words.

[3] This word "holy" is not found in the *Gelasian Sacramentary.*

and repose in the sleep of peace. To these, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, grant, we pray Thee, a place of refreshment, light, and peace. Through the same Christ our Lord. *Amen.*[1]

K. "To us also, Thy sinful servants, who trust in the abundance of Thy mercies, do Thou vouchsafe to give some lot and fellowship with Thy holy Apostles and Martyrs; with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and all Thy Saints: into whose company we beseech Thee to admit us, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences. Through Christ our Lord.

L. "By whom, O Lord, Thou dost always create, sanctify, quicken, bless, and bestow upon us all these good things.

"By Him, and with Him, and in Him, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory is unto Thee, O God the Father Almighty. World without end. *Amen.*"

The first paragraph consists of a petition to God to bless the oblations, followed by a petition on behalf of the Church, the Pope, the Bishop of the diocese, and all Christians. The second paragraph is a commemoration of the living, and this is followed by the third paragraph setting forth the communion of saints and requesting that their prayers may be made on our behalf. The fourth paragraph asks for the acceptance of the oblation, for peace, and for deliverance from evil. The fifth paragraph makes petition for a blessing on the elements, that they become the Body and Blood of Christ.[2] Next in order

[1] The *Memento* of the departed is wanting in the *Gelasian Sacramentary* and some other early MSS.

[2] Cf. the Egyptian rite as represented in the Sacramentary of Serapion, the Liturgy of S. Mark, and the Liturgy of the Coptic Jacobites. See p. 117, note 4.

is the Narrative of Institution, which, with the exception of the epithets applied to our Lord's hands, and the expression "the Mystery of Faith" put into our Lord's mouth in the giving of the cup, is in close accord with the New Testament accounts of the Institution. Then follows the usual paragraph wherein Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension are commemorated, and the gifts of bread and wine presented as memorials before God. Next God is asked favourably to regard these offerings, as of old He looked with favour upon those of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek. Next comes the petition that God would bid these oblations to be carried up to His heavenly altar by the hands of His holy Angel, so that as the result of this exaltation of the oblations, those who receive, by partaking of the elements, the Body and Blood of Christ, may be filled with grace and blessing.

The equivalence of this paragraph (*Supplices te*) to the Invocation of other Liturgies has been most clearly established by Dr. Hoppe in a thorough and scholarly treatise published about forty years ago,[1] wherein too he showed the persistence of this original notion in the face of the later theory to which the Roman Church is committed. In view of all the evidence reviewed by Dr. Hoppe,[2] there is no explanation which will fit the facts of the case save that the Roman Epiklesis uses symbolical or metaphorical language to express what all other Liturgies express more plainly. In other words, — the "heavenly altar" stands for the human nature of Christ at God's right hand, the "complete carrying up" of the elements is the change into Christ's Body and Blood, and the "hand of God's holy Angel" is the operation of the Holy Ghost. In the time when the *Canon Missae* was

[1] *Die Epiklesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgieen und der römische Consekrationskanon*, von Dr. Ludwig Augustin Hoppe, Schaffhausen, 1864.

[2] *Op. cit.* (Part I.), pp. 93–210, esp. pp. 116–191.

framed (surely not later than the early part of the fourth century),[1] those who used it (and that in all probability alongside of a Greek Anaphora of the Alexandrian type) would have understood the celebrant in the *Supplices te* to pray: "We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be translated (or transformed) to the Body and Blood of Christ by the act of Thy Holy Spirit, that as many of us as shall, from this participation of the altar,[2] receive the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace." Upon this hypothesis we can understand many things otherwise inexplicable. For example, the Roman *Canon Missae*, and the Latin Liturgy, seem to have displaced the Greek Anaphora and Liturgy alongside of which they were originally used,[3] and that without apparently a suspicion of any change of rationale. Then again the words of Gelasius I.[4] and those ascribed to Gregory the Great [5] are entirely clear only in reference to such an understanding of the *Canon Missae*, and it is not necessary to

[1] Cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 176–177; Frere-Procter, *op. cit.*, p. 440. Note the curious reference of the author of *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (see Appendix, pp. 251–252) to the paragraph *Supra quae*, in which he regards the mention of Melchizedek as signifying the Holy Spirit.

[2] The variants of the latter part of the *Supplices te* do but serve to strengthen the conviction that the "translation of the elements to the heavenly altar by the hand of the holy Angel" is the metaphorical equivalent of the prayer for their transformation by the operation of the Holy Spirit into Christ's Body and Blood. "From this sanctification of the altar," and "from this altar of sanctification," instead of "from this participation of the altar," indicate very strongly that the consecration of the elements is considered to have been effected by the "translation" of them already prayed for. See Appendix, p. 362.

[3] Cf. Burbidge, *op. cit.* (see above, p. 123, note 2), and Frere-Procter, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

[4] See above, p. 74, and Appendix, pp. 276–277.

[5] See above, p. 79, and Appendix, pp. 280–281.

suppose (against all the evidence) that the Roman Church once used a plainly worded Epiklesis in the Liturgy and afterward laid it aside. Moreover the equivalence of the *Canon Missae* (in regard to Eucharistic consecration) with all other Liturgies made easy the process whereby it supplanted all other Anaphoræ in Western Christendom. At the same time this symbolical or metaphorical cast of language in the Roman Invocation made it easier [1] to slight its original significance when the germ of the new theory made its appearance in the ninth century, viz. that the repetition of Christ's words of declaration, "This is My Body, This is My Blood," effected the consecration. This theory, we may note in passing, shows great confusion of mind upon the part of its promulgators, for it fogs the clear distinction between the original institution of the Eucharist by Christ and the observance of that service by His Church,[2] and, ignoring the plain statements of Scripture, represents Our Lord's words of administration as the consecration, which consecration He had wrought by His blessing,[3] before He administered the sacrament to His Apostles. This theory also utterly defies the universal use of the quoted Narrative of Christ's Institution as the pattern and charter for our keeping of His Eucharistic memorial, as the prelude and ground of our oblation of the elements of bread and wine in remembrance of Him and of our impetration for God's acceptance and blessing upon them.

The best comment upon this prayer (*i.e. Supplices te*) is that of Monsignor Duchesne, who says:

"This prayer is far from exhibiting the precision of the Greek formularies, in which there is a specific mention of the grace prayed for, that is, the intervention of the Holy Spirit to effect the transformation of the bread and

[1] Cf. Florus, *On the Exposition of the Mass*, pp. 150–154 below, and Appendix, p. 381–384.

[2] Cf. Chap. II., pp. 29, 33. [3] See above, Chap. II., pp. 25–27.

wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. It is true, nevertheless, (1) that it occupies, in regard to the subject-matter and the logical connection of the formulary, the exact place of the Greek *Epiclesis;* and (2) that it also is a prayer to God for His intervention in the mystery. But whilst the Greek Liturgies use here clear and simple terms, the Roman Liturgy embodies its meaning in symbolical forms. It prays that the angel of the Lord may take the oblation from the visible altar and bear it to the highest heaven, to the invisible altar, before the shrine of the Divine Majesty. This symbolical transference is in a contrary sense to that implied in the Greek formulary; it involves not the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the oblation, but the elevation by God's angel of the oblation to heaven. But in both cases alike it is after it has been brought near to, and has participated in, the Divine Virtue that it is called the Body and Blood of Christ."[1]

[1] *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, par l'abbé L. Duchesne (deuxième édition), Paris, 1898, p. 173.

"Cette prière est loin d'avoir la précision des formules grecques où l'on spécifie expressément la grâce demandée, c'est-à-dire l'intervention du Saint-Esprit pour opérer la transformation du pain et du vin au corps et au sang de Jésus-Christ. Il n'en est pas moins vrai: 1° qu'elle occupe, dans la suite matérielle et logique de la formule, exactement la même place que l'épiclèse grecque; 2° qu'elle est aussi une prière adressée à Dieu pour qu'il intervienne dans le mystère. Mais, au lieu que les liturgies grecques s'expriment en termes clairs et simples, la liturgie romaine s'enveloppe ici de formes symboliques. Elle demande que l'ange du Seigneur prenne l'oblation sur l'autel visible et la porte au plus haut des cieux, sur l'autel invisible élevé devant le trône de la majesté divine. Le mouvement symbolique est de sens contraire à celui des formules grecques: ce n'est pas le Saint-Esprit qui descend vers l'oblation, c'est l'oblation qui est emportée au ciel par l'ange de Dieu. Mais, dans un cas comme dans l'autre, c'est après son rapprochement, sa communication, avec la vertu divine qu'on parle d'elle comme du corps et du sang du Christ."

The translation in the text is from the English edition, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, S. P. C. K., London, 1903, pp. 181–182.

No other words need be added to these which so thoroughly recognize this paragraph of the *Canon Missae* as the Invocation of the Roman rite.

After the Invocation follows the commemoration of the dead in Christ, and a second commemoration of the Saints, and the whole prayer is concluded by a double doxology.

Surely there can be but one opinion regarding the *Canon Missae* in its textual meaning. It is the complete parallel in rationale of the Eucharistic Prayer of the Eastern Liturgies, and of the Western "Conformation of the Sacrament." S. Isidore was right. In his day, at least, the whole world celebrated the Eucharist in the same manner, the oblations of the Church were consecrated by her mystical prayer to God for that end.[1]

The Gallican rite was supplanted by the Roman rite in the latter part of the eighth century in France. Alcuin (735–804 A.D.) was active in spreading the Roman use. In his *Disputatio Puerorum* (Chap. X., "Of the Mass") he applies S. Isidore's description of the seven prayers of the Mass to the Roman rite.[2] The whole prayer from *Te igitur, i.e.* the *Canon Missae,* he puts under the heading of *Confirmatio sacramenti,* thus showing most plainly the equivalence of the two rites in the consecration of the Eucharist. Moreover, it stands to reason that the Gallican rite could not have been so quickly displaced by the Roman, if the latter had possessed a different rationale of the central prayer of the Liturgy. Alcuin in his *Liber Sacramentorum* has preserved for us a few of the old *Post Pridie* prayers, though putting them in connection with the offertory as prayers *Super oblata,* the *Canon Missae* having displaced all variants formerly used in the *Conformatio sacramenti.* One of these is quite striking.

"We are mindful, O eternal God, Almighty Father, of the glorious passion of Thy Son, of His resurrection also, and of His ascension into heaven. Therefore we beseech

[1] See Appendix, pp. 282–283. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 366.

Thy Majesty, O God, that the prayers of our humility may ascend in the sight of Thy tender mercy, and that there may descend upon this bread and upon this cup the fulness of Thy Divinity. May there descend also, O Lord, the incomprehensible and unseen Majesty of Thy Holy Spirit, as of old He was wont to descend upon the offerings of the Fathers. Through the same Lord." [1] Old associations could not suffer the entire abandonment of this prayer, although its concluding petition, that the elements might become the Body and Blood of Christ, would be dropped in its new position.

Alcuin had a large share in the Caroline Books, submitted to the Council of Frankfort in 794.[2] In Book II., Chap. XXVII., the consecration of the Eucharist is touched upon. The allusions made are of such a character as to show indubitably that the consecration of the Eucharist was referred to the prayer *Supplices te* of the *Canon Missae*, and that the Narrative of Institution was recited purely historically and as the charter for our obedient observance of Christ's holy rite, ordained by Him as the Christian memorial sacrifice which supplants the rites of the old dispensation. We read as follows:—

"The sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord ordained by that same Mediator of God and men for the commemoration of His passion and of our salvation, is consecrated by the hand of the priest and by the Invocation of the Divine Name. . . . At the consecration of these [the elements] the vested priest, mingling the supplications of the people standing around with his own prayers, groaning within himself makes memorial of the Lord's passion, and resurrection from the dead, and also of His most glorious ascension into heaven, and earnestly requests that these [the elements] be carried by the hand of the Angel unto God's heavenly altar and into the

[1] See Appendix, p. 366.

[2] Cf. *Dictionnaire d'Arch. Chrét. et de Lit.*, col. 1077.

presence of His majesty. . . . For the very Creator of the human race, who for our sake and for our salvation, did not abhor to take our flesh, when he established both the end of the old Covenant and the health-giving beginning of the New, on the eve of His most sacred passion, in Himself as the corner-stone joining both walls, and (according to the Apostle) making of both one, having taken bread, and having blessed and broken it, gave this salutary precept to His disciples: 'Take ye,' said He, 'and eat, this is My Body.' And likewise taking the cup after supper, He gave it to His disciples, saying: 'Take ye and drink, for this is My Blood of the New and eternal Covenant which for you and for many shall be poured out for the remission of sins. As often as ye do these things, ye shall do them for My memorial.' . . . Much, therefore, as beyond what can be surveyed by the mind's eye, does the sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood differ from likenesses limned by the skill of painters: since that forsooth is consecrated by the invisible operation of the Spirit of God, these visibly by the hand of the artist; that is consecrated by the priest by the Invocation of the Divine Name, these are limned by the painter with the skill of human art; that is carried up by the hands of the Angel unto God's heavenly altar, these made by human hands through art are placed for the gaze of the admiring upon the wall."[1]

It is evident that the "symbolical forms" under which the Roman Invocation was clothed conveyed the same thoughts and expressed the same intentions as did the more explicit Eastern and Gallican Invocations. Else Theodulph of Orleans († 821 A.D.) could not have written as follows: —

"For it is a saving sacrifice which in the Old Testament Melchizedek, King of Salem, offered in type of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and which in the New, the

[1] See Appendix, pp. 366–367.

same Mediator of God and men fulfilled before He was betrayed, when taking bread and a cup and blessing them and giving them to His disciples He bade that these things be done in memorial of Him. Therefore this mystery of sacrifice, the old offerings being abandoned and brought to an end, the Church celebrates, offering bread on account of the 'living Bread that came down from heaven,' wine on account of Him who said, 'I am the true Vine'; to the end that, by the visible oblation of the priests, and by the invisible consecration of the Holy Ghost, the bread and wine may be translated unto the dignity of the Body and Blood of the Lord." [1]

Similarly Agobard of Lyons († 840 A.D.) says: —

"For the divine sacraments, that is to say, baptism and the consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and other things in which the health and life of the faithful consist, are so great and so holy, that neither by the merits of good men can they be improved, nor by the wickedness of evil men can they be lowered in efficiency, since at the Invocation of the High Priest, not by human power, but by the might of the Holy Ghost are they ineffably perfected." [2]

Pope Nicholas I., writing to the Emperor Michael (860 A.D.), uses language, in reference to Eucharistic consecration, in consonance with the Eastern and universal ancient tradition of the Church, when he says of the Lord's table, "Because indeed it has been consecrated by God's help and has received a blessing, whereby also it is constituted a holy table; the bread likewise, which is offered upon it, is indeed common bread: but when it has been consecrated in the sacrament, it becomes in truth, and is called, the Body of Christ. So also the wine, a thing of slight present value before the blessing, after the sanctification of the Spirit is made the Blood of Christ." [3]

[1] See Appendix, pp. 367–368.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 368.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 369.

Rabanus Maurus (776–856 A.D.) comments upon the order of the mass (in part) as follows: —

"After the angelic hymn which the whole clergy sings together in chorus, follows the prayer by which the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord is consecrated, which begins thus, *Te igitur*." [1] Commenting on the word "sacrifices" (*these holy undefiled sacrifices*) he says, "Sacrifices are those things which are consecrated with prayers." [2] On the Narrative and on the opening words of the Oblation, he says: —

"And He wished that bread and wine be offered by us to Him and by Him be divinely consecrated, and that His faithful people believe the mystery to be true which He delivered to His disciples saying: 'Take ye and eat all of this.' Likewise of the cup He said: 'Take ye and drink all of it.' And when He lifted up His eyes to heaven and gave thanks to the Father, He taught us thereby that we ought always to pray the Father that He vouchsafe to perfect so great a sacrament through our hands. And when He said, 'As often as ye do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me,' He bade us to be continually mindful of that passion which He sustained for us, and especially at the time when we are celebrating this sacrament, and trust ourselves to His mercy and goodness. *Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, and likewise Thy holy people, having in remembrance*, etc. What was commanded him by the Lord, this the priest professes to have done. For therefore the priests of the Son of God, that is, of the Lord Jesus Christ, ought to be faithfully mindful, because they celebrate mass, and offer sacrifice instructed by Christ's example; and they ought to know what they celebrate, because foolish is the request, if one requests he knows not what." [3]

[1] *Liber de sacris ordinibus*, etc., Chap. XIX. See Appendix, p. 369.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 369.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 370.

Shortly after this, concerning the Oblation of the gifts, he says: —

"O Lord, mindful of all Thy loving kindnesses which we have mentioned, we offer to Thy Majesty *a pure offering*, that is with a pure heart, for pure is Thy Body which we believe to be made of this Bread. *A holy offering*, because Thou didst sanctify Thy Body when Thou tookest manhood into God, and do Thou now sanctify this bread that it may become Thy Body. *A spotless offering*, because, though without spot of sin, Thou didst suffer for us. *The holy bread of life eternal*, because Thou art the living Bread, who camest down from heaven, and in this bread sanctified by Thee Thou didst will us to receive Thy Body, and through the cup of Thy passion didst will us to take Thy Blood. Do Thou sanctify this offering that it may become for us Thy Body and Thy Blood." [1]

The question at once suggests itself, Could Rabanus Maurus by any possibility have commented thus in his consideration of the memorial Oblation, if the notion had ever entered his mind that the elements had been already consecrated by, and at, the rehearsal of our Lord's words of declaration in the Narrative of Institution? To this question there can be but one answer, No, most emphatically and unhesitatingly, No.[2]

With regard to the Invocation proper we find him saying: —

"Both in bread and wine He willed us to copy the mystery of His passion, when in giving the bread and the cup to His disciples He said, 'This is My Body; and this is the cup of My Blood.' And we ought to entreat that as the oblations of the aforesaid fathers were accepted, so might ours become accepted. *We humbly beseech Thee,*

[1] *Liber de sacris ordinibus*, etc. Chap. XIX. See Appendix, p. 370.

[2] It is worthy of note that a subsequent writer faults Rabanus because of this very comment. See Gerbert, *Mon. Vet. Lit. Alem.*, Vol. II., p. 274, col. *a*.

Almighty God, command these things to be carried up by the hands of Thy holy Angel to Thine altar on high, in the sight of Thy divine Majesty. Humbly therefore we make request that our oblations offered upon this altar which can be seen, our heavenly Father may command to be carried up by the hand of His holy Angel to that high altar which is before His divine Majesty, which with our eyes we cannot see, because it is not material but spiritual. And just as we cannot fathom the divine Majesty of the Father, so neither ought we attempt to fathom those things which are in His sight, but rather to believe. *That as many of us as shall, from this participation of the altar, receive the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace.* We ought indeed to pray to our heavenly Father, that all of us who, from participation of this very altar upon which we offer to God the Father in commemoration of His Son our Lord God Jesus Christ, take the Body and Blood of the aforesaid Son of God, may deserve to receive all heavenly benediction through the same Christ our Lord." [1]

Let us bring our brief series of extracts to a close by quoting his paraphrase of the first part of the concluding doxology.

"In this we pray that through Christ Thy only-begotten Son, by whom all good things have been created, sanctified, and quickened, do Thou bless these sacraments, and proffer them to us to be received as an inexhaustible source of healing." [2]

If we turn to the earliest *Ordines Romani*, we shall find that they presuppose the view of the *Canon Missae* which we have been outlining. *Ordo Romanus I.*, drawn up about 770 A.D.,[3] tells us that after the *Sanctus* "the Pontiff

[1] See Appendix, pp. 370–371. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 371.

[3] Cf. *Ordo Romanus Primus, with Introduction and Notes* by E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., London, 1905, pp. 3–7. Mr. Atchley's edition of *Ordo Rom. I.* ought to be read by every

rises alone and enters on the Canon. The bishops, however, and the deacons, subdeacons, and presbyters remain in the presbytery, and bow themselves down. Now when he [the Pontiff] says, *To us also Thy sinful servants*, the subdeacons rise, and when he says, *By Whom all these things, O Lord*, the archdeacon rises alone. When he says, *By Him and with Him*, the archdeacon lifts up the chalice with the offertory-veil passed through its handles, and, holding it, raises it towards the Pontiff. The Pontiff moreover touches the side of the chalice with the loaves saying, *By Him, and with Him*, as far as, *For ever and ever. Amen.*" [1]

In other words, all the attendant ministers stand in their places with heads bowed down until after the Invocation (*Supplices te*) has been said by the Pope, for no one thought of imagining that the elements were to be considered as consecrated until that prayer had been said. Moreover, no elevation of the consecrated elements is even hinted at until the end of the Canon is reached.[2] The *Ordo of St. Amand* (c. 800 A.D.), which was apparently prepared as a semi-official description of the Pope's stational mass for the information of some Church, most probably in Gaul,[3] that wished to pattern

one who wishes to get a correct idea of the Roman rite before the doctrinal innovations of the ninth century and the ceremonial innovations of the twelfth and succeeding centuries had changed the rationale of the *Canon Missae*, as understood by those who used it, so as to bring the Roman Church into a position of difference from, and antagonism to, the Catholic doctrine and practice regarding the consecration of the Eucharist, and to her own earlier belief as well. See especially Part II., §§ XI., XIII., and XVI. (pp. 89–90, 96–99, 102–103).

[1] See Appendix, p. 362.

[2] Cf. De Vert, *Explication . . . des Cérémonies de l'Eglise* (in four volumes), Paris, 1720, 1710, 1713, 1713; Vol. III., pp. 305–306. Cf. *Tracts on the Mass*, edited by Dr. J. Wickham Legg (Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. XXVII, 1904), pp. 241–243, 263–264.

[3] See Atchley, *op. cit.*, pp. 3–4. Cf. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, pp. 149–150. See Appendix, p. 364.

its ceremonial after that of the Roman Court, gives us the same picture as *Ordo I.* An adaptation of the Roman Ordo for the use of Besançon (tenth century) [1] repeats the direction of *Ordo I.* with scarcely a verbal difference. An adaptation of the *Ordo Romanus* for the use of Amiens (c. 1050 A.D.) is even more explicit, "After the singing of the angelic hymn, the subdeacons stand behind the altar facing the bishop with face bowed down until the Body and Blood of the Lord be consecrated, and they hear, *Nobis quoque peccatoribus" (To us also Thy sinful servants).* [2] The celebrant, be he Pope, bishop, or humble presbyter, recited the Canon in so low a voice as to be inaudible to those standing near, and after the Invocation he raised his voice slightly so as to indicate that the consecration had been accomplished.[3]

Ordo Romanus II., a Gallican recension of *Ordo I.* made in the ninth century,[4] adds a few words in reference to the signs of the cross which occur in different parts of the Canon. After the *Sanctus* with its *Hosannas* have been ended, we are told that

"The Pontiff rises alone, and silently enters upon the Canon, and the deacons and subdeacons and presbyters all remain in the presbytery bowing themselves down. And in the Canon also six orders of crosses are observed, of which the first is, where it is said, *That Thou wouldest accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy undefiled sacrifices.* The second, forsooth, is where it is said, *And this oblation, we beseech Thee, O God, do Thou vouchsafe to make in all things blessed, approved, ratified.* The third indeed is the order of cross where it is narrated, *And taking bread into His holy and venerable hands, He*

[1] British Museum MS. (Additional) 15,222. See Appendix, pp. 364-365.

[2] British Museum MS. (Additional) 17,004. See Appendix, p. 365.

[3] Cf. an early Ambrosian *Ordo Missarum.* See Appendix, p. 365.

[4] See Atchley, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

blessed it. Likewise, *Giving thanks to Thee He blessed it.* The fourth, where it is subjoined, *A pure offering, a holy offering, a spotless offering, the holy bread of life eternal, and the cup of everlasting salvation.* The fifth, where it is said, *By Whom, O Lord, Thou dost always create, sanctify, quicken, bless, and bestow upon us all these good things.* The sixth order follows, where it is uttered, *By Him, and with Him, and in Him,* when the chalice is touched with the oblate. . . . And the priest when he says, *We humbly beseech Thee,* with head inclined, bows himself before the altar. And when he says, speaking with audible voice, *To us also, Thy sinful servants,* the subdeacons rise, and stand in the place where they stood before, and look up into the face of the Pontiff. When he says *By Whom all these things, O Lord,* the archdeacon rises alone: and when he says *By Him, and with Him,* he lifts the chalice with the offertory-veil passed through the handles, and holds it lifting it up towards the Pontiff. The Pontiff then touches the chalice on its side, making two crosses with the oblates, and saying, *By Him, and with Him,* as far as, *world without end.*" [1]

In reading this account it is obvious that the rehearsal of the original Institution is regarded, in distinction from the other parts of the *Canon Missae,* as a quotation, a narrative (*ubi narratur*), and the signs of the cross made therein at the recital of the words, "He blessed," are consequently mimetic or illustrative of the benediction our Lord made upon the occasion when He instituted the Eucharist. In the other places where the sign of the cross is made in the Canon, it is the usual deictic act, whereby the oblations are pointed out and designated, either as the oblations mentioned by the celebrant as offered in memorial of Christ, or as the elements (ordained by Christ) upon which a blessing is impetrated, as the case

[1] See Appendix, p. 363.

may be, according to the phraseology of each particular part of the Canon where the signs are made. We note also in this *Ordo* the low bow, upon the part of the celebrant, at the beginning of the Invocation,[1] and the lifting up of the elements at the closing doxology, as in *Ordo I.*[2]

Amalarius († 850 A.D.), who had before him an *Ordo* closely akin to the preceding, completes our knowledge of the ceremonial that was used in the ninth century in connection with the *Canon Missae.* In his *Eclogues on the Office of the Mass*[3] we learn, in addition to what we already know, that the celebrant bowed down at the words *This oblation therefore* (*Hanc igitur*); and also that near the opening of the Invocation (which he said bowing profoundly and remaining bowed until the words *That as many of us*) the celebrant prayed privately at discretion.[4]

[1] Cf. Hoppe, *op. cit.*, pp. 197–201. This is one of the few ceremonial acts that have a just title to the name Catholic. The celebrant having commemorated the great work of Christ in our behalf, and having offered the elements in memorial thereof, bowed low as he began the Invocation, indicating his sense of unworthiness to approach and impetrate the acceptance and consecration of the elements by the Almighty Father. This act is still retained in the ceremonial of the Roman rite, though its true significance is ignored. It is very interesting to note that those who strive to pervert the meaning of the Invocation in our own Prayer of Consecration after the pattern of the present official Roman understanding of the *Canon Missae*, are careful to pass over this ancient gesture.

[2] This lifting up of the elements at the close of the Canon was probably originally associated with the idea of the "translation of the elements to the heavenly altar" in the *Supplices te.* The paragraphs "J" and "K" of the *Canon* did not, in all probability, stand where they do now, and thus the doxology (paragraph "L") followed at once upon the close of the *Supplices te.*

Cf. Frere-Procter, *op. cit.*, pp. 447–448, especially note 2 on this last page; also *Paléographie Musicale*, Vol. V., pp. 77–83.

[3] See Appendix, pp. 372–373.

[4] Cf. a direction, at the opening of *Supplices te* in a twelfth century Missal, for the priest to bow toward the altar and say three times, "God be merciful to me a sinner." See Appendix, p. 365.

This would be most probably a petition for mercy in view of his own unworthiness to draw nigh and invoke the Divine blessing on the oblations of the Church. From his treatise *Of Ecclesiastical Offices* we also learn that the celebrant took the bread and the cup into his hands at those words of the Narrative which describe our Lord as doing so.[1] This is again as plainly an illustrative or dramatic act as the signing of the cross over the bread and cup respectively, in the same Narrative of Institution. It is significant that the *Micrologus*, a treatise written in the eleventh century by Bernold of Constance, shows us a ceremonial of the *Canon Missae* differing not at all from that of Amalarius in the points under consideration.[2]

In the year 858 the bishops of the two archdioceses of Rouen and Reims, assembled at Quierci, in a long letter written to Louis of Germany, giving their reasons why they refuse an oath of vassalage to him, declare that "It is abominable that the hand anointed with the sacred chrism, which out of bread, and wine mixed with water, through the prayer and the sign of the cross consecrates the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, whatever it may have done before ordination, should after ordination to the episcopate touch a secular oath in anywise." [3] It is obvious that the consecration of the Eucharist was considered by these bishops as effected by the Church's prayer to that end, and that the oblations of bread and wine were marked out by the sign of the cross, in the course of that prayer, as the objects for which the hallowing was asked. It is also abundantly evident that the theory that the mere recitation of our Lord's words of administration effected the consecration, had never even been heard of by them.

Another most notable confirmation of the old tradition

[1] Book III., Chap. XXIV. See Appendix, p. 371. Cf. De Vert, *op. cit.*, Vol. I., pp. 159–160, 249–250; Vol. III., p. 253.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 374–375. [3] See Appendix, p. 374.

in the interpretation of the *Canon Missae* is to be found in the pictures with which the limner illustrated the Canon in a Sacramentary of the tenth century [1] once preserved at the monastery of S. Blaise in the Black Forest. One of these represents the celebrant standing erect and making the signs of the cross in the preliminary Invocation (*Quam oblationem*).[2] The second portrays the celebrant bowing low for the Invocation proper (*Supplices te*).[3] The third illustration is given to the *Agnus Dei*, before the priest's communion.[4] Thus this artist of the tenth century, in picking out those parts of the *Canon Missae* to illustrate, which were in his day considered of special importance, gives us a stronger proof of contemporary belief than even verbal testimony could furnish.[5]

[1] Cf. Delisle, *Mémoire sur d'Anciens Sacramentaires*, p. 192.

[2] Gerbert, *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicae*, typis San-Blasianis, 1777, Vol. I., p. 234.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 235. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 237.

[5] After the later theory of consecration by the recitation of our Lord's words in the Narrative of Institution had come in, we find the elevation of the host after *Hoc est enim corpus meum* chosen as the most important act to illustrate. The ancient understanding and importance of the *Supplices te* was still so strongly felt when *this* manuscript was written, that the limner, reflecting the belief of his time, all unconsciously has left behind a witness, not lightly to be gainsaid, of the fact that Rome was then at one with the rest of the Catholic Church in her Eucharistic Prayer.

The study of the growth of the rubrics in the *Canon Missae*, especially in the Narrative of Institution, as witnessed by the MSS., affords strong corroborative testimony to this fact.

If one will take the trouble to ex mine the MSS. contained in any fair-sized collection, he will be well repaid. Not only the variety in the rubrics (if there are any), but also the details of the scribes' work, show plainly the theological atmosphere in which they worked and prayed. The earlier Missals and Sacramentaries, knowing nothing of the notion of consecration by mere recitation of our Lord's words of declaration, do not exaggerate the size or decoration of these words. In this connection we may compare, *e.g.*, a Gregorian Sacramentary, written at Como, Italy, in the eleventh century, and a Missal, written at Bergamo in the four-

Moreover, it is deeply significant that the scribe of this manuscript, in writing in the rubrics, which correspond almost exactly with those of the *Eclogues of Amalarius*, did not put in any indication of the picking up of the bread and cup and of the sign of the cross made over each separately in the Narrative of Institution,[1] which mimetic gestures we know to have been in use, from Amalarius's own testimony, in the ninth century.[2] The reason is not far to seek; the Narrative of Institution was but the prelude, and had no direct bearing as effecting, *ipso facto*, the consecration of the Eucharistic elements.

The rationale and accompanying ceremonial of the *Canon Missae* at the period under consideration we find to be parallel with that of the other Liturgies of Christendom.[3] The consecration of the Eucharist was regarded

teenth century. In the first (Bodleian, MS. Lat. liturg. d. 4) the first word of *Qui pridie* is not given even a capital letter, the Narrative being merely a quotation in the paragraph that includes from *Quam oblationem* down to the Invocation, *Supplices te*. Rubrics added in the margin by a later hand, direct the simple picking up of the host and chalice in the Narrative of Institution, the profound inclination before the Invocation, and the raising of the voice after it. In the second, however (British Museum Add. MS., 15,120), we find the words of declaration, "Hoc est enim corpus meum," etc., in letters about two and a half times as large as the rest of the text of the Canon. In an English MS. of about the year 1188, that once belonged to a monk of the Benedictine abbey of St. Werburgh at Chester (Bodleian, MS. Tanner 169*, part 3), we note that the places emphasized by the scribe are the opening words of the Canon, *Te igitur*, and the opening words of the *Supplices te*, marking out thus the all importance of the Invocation. Examples might be multiplied and the growth of rubrics fully shown, but space forbids.

[1] It is obvious that these mimetic acts had not yet assumed the importance in men's minds which they afterward did when perverted.

[2] See Appendix, p. 371.

[3] What is the rationale of all the Eastern Anaphoræ we have seen above in Chap. III., *q.v.*

as God's act in reply to the prayer of His Church for the acceptance and hallowing of her oblations of bread and wine offered in commemoration of Christ's sacrifice. The universal Church in celebrating the Eucharist clung closely to the analogy of her Master's Institution. After uttering hearty praises to Almighty God for all His loving-kindnesses in creation and redemption, the Charter of the holy rite is read, and as the celebrant rehearses the story of how Christ instituted His service of memorial, he illustrates the narrative with dramatic gestures, setting forth thus most eloquently before the Almighty Father the Warrant of His dear Son that emboldens His people to offer the Christian Sacrifice. Then obedient to her Master, the Church, by her representative, ever mindful of all that Christ has wrought for her, offers the antitypical oblations; and as the priest prays for the acceptance of the Church's offering, he bows low, confessing his own unworthiness and seeking of God that He hallow the bread and wine, in answer to the Invocation or Epiklesis. We may confidently acquiesce in the words with which Dr. Hoppe epitomizes the results of his researches regarding the significance of the *Supplices te* of the *Canon Missae*: "Therefore, if we sum up the foregoing inquiry, the entire agreement of the Roman Canon of Consecration with that of the Greek and Oriental Liturgies has been shown. The act of Consecration is there, as here, made complete *liturgically* by a 'solemnis oratio,' by a great act of Prayer and Blessing, by the Invocation of the creative Power of God, by the *Epiklesis* of the Holy Ghost. The method of Consecration of the Roman Church differs neither in point of textual expression, nor in ceremonial, from that of the Eastern Churches." [1]

[1] *Die Epiklesis*, etc., pp. 209–210. "Sonach hat sich, wenn wir die bisherige Untersuchung zusammenfassen, die ausnahmslose Congruenz des römischen Consecrationskanon mit jenem der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgieen ergeben. Der Conse-

The question next presents itself as to the time or occasion when the theory of Eucharistic consecration developed by the Schoolmen first took its rise. This would seem to be largely the outcome of the Paschasian controversy in the ninth century, wherein we find traces of confusion of thought evident in the writings of Paschasius himself, a confusion which later came to dominate the notions of Eucharistic consecration in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and was stereotyped both in dogma and ceremonial praxis in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The materialistic theology of Paschasius and his followers triumphed over the older and more primitive belief of his opponents,[1] and this carried along with it the new confusion of thought in regard to the consecration of the Eucharist, into a place of dominance throughout Western Christendom. The development of the doctrine of transubstantiation and of the notion that the Eucharist is consecrated by the recital of Christ's words of declaration or administration to His Apostles went on together,[2] the latter influenced by the ignorance of the Fathers that prevailed and by the isolation of the two great divisions of Christendom from each other.[3]

crationsact ist dort, wie hier, *liturgisch* zu einer 'solemnis oratio,' zu einem grossen Gebets- und Segensacte, zur Anrufung der schaffenden Gottesmacht, zur *Epiklese* des heiligen Geiste ausgewachsen. Der Consecrationsmodus der römischen Kirche differirt weder textlich, noch rituell von dem der morgenländischen Kirchen."

[1] Cf. Bishop Gore, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation,* New York, 1895, p. 264. "However much later scholastics may have refined the doctrine of transubstantiation, in its original form as held and pressed upon the 'heretics' it was of a plainly materialistic and superstitious character."

[2] This is not understood as generally as it should be. The Eastern Churches, however much they may have adopted in later times the equivalents of Latin Scholastic theological terms, have kept far closer to the earlier ages of the Church, not only in their belief and practice in the celebration of the Liturgy, but also in their concept of the Eucharistic Presence of Christ.

[3] Cf. Le Brun, *Défense,* etc., pp. 59 *seq.*, especially pp. 59, 63, 89.

In looking into Paschasius's treatise *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, we find strong evidence of the hold of the old tradition of the Church upon him, alongside of the germs of the revolutionary theory that was to supplant it entirely, later on.

Thus (in Chap. IV., 3) we read, "Assuredly it is the true flesh of Christ, which was crucified and buried, truly it is the sacrament of that flesh, which by the priest is divinely consecrated upon the altar by Christ's word (*in verbo Christi*) through the Holy Ghost; whence the Lord Himself proclaims: *This is My Body.*" [1] This as it stands might be nothing more than an affirmation that it is by the command of Christ that the sacrament is consecrated. But in view of what Paschasius says in Chap. XV., these words seem rather to indicate the beginning of that confusion of Institution and Observance which worked such havoc in the Liturgy of the West.

In the eighth chapter, in speaking of the unworthy receiver, Paschasius says:—

"Neither does he fear the presence of the divine Majesty, while he thinks there is nothing more than the things which are seen, nor does the wretched man realize that the flesh of Christ is never rightly received save from His hand and from the heavenly altar where Christ, 'the High Priest of good things to come,' intercedes for all. Whence the priest when he begins to dedicate these things, among other things says: *Command that these things be carried up by the hand of Thy holy Angel unto Thy heavenly altar in the sight of Thy divine Majesty.* And do you think, O man, to receive that from any other place than from that altar where having been carried aloft it is consecrated?" [2]

"But perchance to this 'blind reason' says: 'And how into heaven before the sight of the divine Majesty is it so suddenly presented, since here, be it called bread or flesh, it is all the time held visibly in the hand of the priest . . .?'

[1] See Appendix, p. 376. [2] See Appendix, p. 377.

Learn that God being Spirit is everywhere without limitation of place. Understand that being spiritual these things are neither locally nor carnally carried on high before the sight of the divine Majesty. . . . Do you think there is any other altar where Christ the High Priest intercedes than His own Body by which and in which He offers to God the Father the vows of the faithful and the faith of the believing? And if that heavenly altar is believed truly to be the Body of Christ, you will not think that you receive the Flesh and Blood of Christ from any other place than from His very Body." [1]

It is surely patent to any reader of these passages that in spite of newer notions, Paschasius was restrained by the traditional view of the *Canon Missae*, which saw in the prayer *Supplices te* the Invocation proper of the Latin rite.

Again in Chap. XII. he refers the consecration of the elements to the word of the Creator [2] and the power of the Holy Spirit, and states that Christ here (as in baptism) acts through the Holy Spirit, to make the oblations His Body and Blood. He continues:—

"For who else had been able to create in the womb that the Word might be made flesh? So also it is to be believed in this mystery, that by the same power of the Holy Spirit, through the word of Christ, His Flesh and Blood are made by an invisible working. Wherefore also the priest

[1] See Appendix, p. 377.

[2] This does not of itself mean more than was suggested by S. Paul's language to S. Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 4, 5), touching the sanctification of food generally, "by the word of God and prayer." This rationale was that accepted by the Fathers (see above, Chap. II., p. 32, note 2) in the consecration of the Eucharist. The hallowing of the material elements appointed was considered to be grounded upon Christ's word of declaration (as once for all spoken by Him) and upon His command (as a living, perduring word), yet effected by the Holy Spirit in each celebration of the Liturgy in answer to the Church's prayer, or Invocation.

says: *Command that these things be carried up unto Thy heavenly altar in the sight of Thy divine Majesty:* for what is his request that they be carried up thither, save that it may be understood that those things be done through His [Christ's] priesthood? For He was made a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek, as the Apostle witnesses, to make intercession for us, presenting Himself before God the Father. . . . Moreover before it is made His Body by consecration, it is the oblation of the priest, as he acknowledges, or of the whole family that offer it: but by the word and by the power of the Holy Spirit it becomes a new creature in the Body of the Creator for our renewal and salvation. Wherefore, near the altar of the heavenly sacrifice He is proved, by the warrant of Scripture, always to stand, so that from His consecration we may receive His Body and Blood." [1]

Here as before we see the same persistent clinging to the *Supplices te* as the most important factor in the *Canon Missae.* In Chap. XV.,[2] however, we find the foundation of the theory which in the next two hundred years shifted the centre of gravity of the *Canon Missae* to the recitation of the Narrative of Institution. Starting from the concept that the Eucharist is consecrated through Christ's commands, he passes to the notion, without apparently realizing the transition, that Christ respeaks His words in the *Qui pridie,* and that all the rest of the Canon is, relatively, unimportant. In his eagerness to assert the absolute material identity of the gift which the communicant receives with that which Christ gave to His apostles, Paschasius tends to overlook those clear distinctions which had heretofore regulated the Church's Eucharistic observance. This chapter is indeed a most confused and illogical piece of work. At one time Paschasius bases the consecration of the Eucharist upon the command of our Lord, "Do this in remembrance of Me," and he seems

[1] See Appendix, p. 378. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 378–381.

to have in mind the function of the celebrant as that of invoking God's blessing. Again apparently it is the repetition of Christ's words of administration, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," which *ipso facto* effects the consecration. This confusion was in all probability due to the exigency of providing a basis for his exceedingly crude conception of what consecration meant. The physical miracle demanded thereby, and the supposed creation of what Berengar, later on, justly described as a *portiuncula carnis*,[1] and the lack of a proper distinction between *sacramentum* and *res sacramenti*, involved necessarily the misapplication of our Lord's words. The development of what afterward became the official doctrine of transubstantiation, and the new notion as to the means of consecration, interacting one upon the other, wove the veil of mistaken and misleading ceremonial which has so long covered the face of the *Canon Missae*. Ratramn, who wrote in criticism of Paschasius, breathes a different atmosphere, going back to S. Isidore of Seville for his inspiration, and holding fast to the old traditions of the undivided Church.[2] But as our concern is primarily with matters liturgical rather than with doctrinal, we must not follow this question further at the present time.

Florus († 859 A.D.) in his treatise *On the Exposition of the Mass* sets before us very plainly both the older view of the *Canon Missae* and the newer in juxtaposition and unreconciled, and in such a manner as shows that he is pleading for something novel, in the very way in which he treats the Narrative of Institution. From different parts of his comment on the Canon we will note a few words. Of the Canon he tells us that after the Preface and *Sanctus*, "The priest begins to pour forth the prayer by which the very mystery of the Lord's Body and Blood is consecrated," [3] a clear reminiscence of tradition.

[1] Cf. Bishop Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 253–254.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 375–376.

[3] § 42. *Ibid.*, pp. 381–382.

In the course of his comment on *Te igitur*, he says,

"Wherefore does the priest say to God the Father, 'We pray and beseech,' except for that which follows, namely, that those things which are offered to Him, the gifts, the presents, the holy sacrifices, He would hold acceptable, that is well pleasing, and would bless them? For it is the part of priests to offer and invoke the Divine Majesty; it is the part of God to vouchsafe to receive and to bless those things which are offered, just as in the Law He commanded the priests saying: 'Thus shall ye bless the children of Israel, and shall say unto them,' and after the words of benediction added: 'They shall invoke My name upon the children of Israel and I will bless them.' What is plainer? 'They shall invoke and I will bless,' and yet He had said before, 'Thus shall ye bless,' but they by prayer, He by granting the blessing. So therefore also in the offering of the divine sacrifice the priests supply the ministry of offering and supplication; but God grants abundantly the gift of blessing through the One true Priest, by whom He both sanctifies the oblations, and having sanctified them accepts them. And so they say, *That Thou wouldest accept and bless*, as if they should humbly say: *We beseech Thee to sanctify these things by Thy Spirit and bless them by Thy Mouth, so that what is done by our humble ministry may be fulfilled by the working of Thy Power.*" [1]

On *Quam oblationem* he comments thus:—

"The Almighty is prayed that, the oblation placed upon His holy altar and commended by such prayers, He will Himself by the power and descent of the Spirit make so valid and perfect a Eucharist, that it may in all respects be approved. . . . That it may also be, by the operation and power of the same Holy Spirit, reasonable and in all these respects severally grateful and acceptable to God; so that, although taken from the simple fruits of the earth, by the

[1] § 43. See Appendix, p. 382.

ineffable power of the divine blessing it may be made the Body and Blood of the Only-begotten Son of God." [1]

So far we have had nothing out of harmony with the older tradition. Let us see what he has to say about the Narrative of Institution, *Qui pridie*.

"In these words, without which no tongue, no country, no nation, that is, no part of the Catholic Church, can make, that is, consecrate the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, the Lord Himself delivered to the Apostles, and the Apostles generally to the whole Church, whereby the universal Church might celebrate the perpetual memorial of her Redeemer. Therefore by the power and words of Christ it is always consecrated and will be consecrated. His utterance it is which sanctifies the heavenly sacraments. He in His priests speaks daily. They fill an office, He operates by the might of His divine power. . . . Wherefore also the Church from tradition consecrating the mystery of the holy Body and Blood of the Lord by these words, deliberately says that the Lord said to the Apostles: 'Take ye and eat ye all of this: for this is My Body. Likewise after supper, taking also this excellent cup.' Let each faithful one take notice what it is that 'this' means, namely that the cup which the Catholic priest sacrifices, is none other than the very one the Lord delivered to His Apostles." [2]

Here, although we have emphatic stress laid upon our Lord's words as recited by the celebrant, yet at the same time we do not find the later and clearly defined teaching of Scholastic theology. Moreover, as we have seen, Florus can speak still of the "consecration of the mystical prayer," [3] and in commenting upon *Supplices te*, as we shall see, give us something of the older tradition, despite his minimizing

[1] § 59. See Appendix, pp. 382–383. Cf. Rupert of Deutz, Appendix, p. 393.

[2] § 60. See Appendix, p. 383.

[3] *Against Amalarius*, I. 9. See Appendix, pp. 384–385.

treatment of it. And from his day onward the *Supplices te* has remained a stumbling-block to the theory of consecration by the mere recitation of our Lord's words.

His comment upon *Supplices te* begins as follows: —

"These words of the mystery are so profound, so wonderful, so amazing, who is able to comprehend them? Who can say anything fittingly? Rather are they to be reverenced and stood in awe of, than to be discussed. Yet blessed Gregory, a fit interpreter of so great a mystery, in a certain place says almost ineffably something about these words as of a thing ineffable. For who of the faithful, he says, can have a doubt that at the very time of the sacrifice, by the voice of the priest the heavens are opened, at that mystery of Jesus Christ the choirs of angels are present, that things lowly are taken into fellowship with things most high, things earthly are joined to things heavenly, and a union of things visible and invisible is brought about?" [1]

Do we not feel, as we listen to these words, as in the case of what Florus had to say about the Narrative of Institution, that the wish is father to the thought? The *Qui pridie* is to stand for something it has not hitherto, and henceforth the *Supplices te* is to be relegated to the realm of "ineffability"! At the same time in quoting S. Gregory he grants the original significance of the Invocation in a degree, as also in the later part of his comment upon it.

"Therefore there takes place at this prayer and holy offering of the consecration something incomprehensible and ineffable, and much more wonderful than all these, that by angelic ministries and supplications as from off the heavenly altar in the sight of the divine Majesty they are offered at that time of offering, when Christ with His heavenly ministers around Him is believed to be present that He may consecrate the offered gifts." [2]

From this time onward we shall continue to find traces

[1] § 66. See Appendix, pp. 383–384. [2] *Ibid.* See Appendix, p. 384.

of the older tradition of consecration by prayer to God for that end, and of the *Supplices te* as the Invocation proper of the *Canon Missae;* for of old the elements were not regarded as consecrated nor as capable of being spoken of as the Body and Blood of Christ until that "time of offering, dedication, or consecration" (*hora immolationis*).[1]

It is not necessary for us to attempt to look into all [2] the writings on the Eucharist which followed the Paschasian controversy. The emphasis laid upon our Lord's word as repeated by the celebrant, as constituting the chief factor in effecting the consecration, did not diminish. At the same time the further development of this notion to the effect that the moment these words were rehearsed, *ipso facto* the elements were at once consecrated, was not at once made. The somewhat double-minded position of Florus, *e.g.*, gave way later to that which ignored everything in the Canon except the recitation of "This is My Body," "This is My Blood." But the Berengarian controversy was needed, and the overthrow of the older faith of the Church by a most materialistic doctrine of transubstantiation,[3] in order to complete the theory of consecration that to this day dominates the whole Roman Church. In the period of transition, we may note, for example, the dictum of a Synod held at Arras in the year 1025, which reads thus:—

"And this sacrifice of bread and of wine mixed with water, by an ineffable sanctification, by the sign of the cross, and by His words is consecrated upon the altar; and when the saving memorial of His passion and resurrection, and also of His ascension into heaven is celebrated, it is

[1] Cf. Paschasius Radbertus, *De Corp. et Sang. Dom.*, VIII. 1; Appendix, p. 377.

[2] Florus was much copied by others, as may be seen from the extracts from the Pseudo-Alcuin, *Of Divine Offices*, and *Confession of Faith;* and from Agobard, *Against Amalarius;* which will be found in the Appendix, pp. 385–386; 368.

[3] Cf. Bishop Gore, *op. cit.*, quoted above, p. 146, note 1.

made the true and proper Body of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself and His true and proper Blood, although it seems to be something else." [1]

In this we see plainly the coördination of a new factor ("by His words") with the two factors mentioned by the bishops assembled at Quierci in 858 A.D.[2]

In the controversy around Berengar of Tours it is not hard to see that Berengar and his opponents differed radically in their notions of the consecration of the Eucharist, and that the condemnation of Berengar and of Ratramn (this last, by mistake, as John Scotus Erigena) gave the needed impetus to a theology built on ignorance of the fathers and of the Eastern Church, on bad philosophy, and on confused thought, which made possible the introduction of the elevation of the elements immediately after the words, "This is My Body," in the twelfth century, and to the further developments of ceremonial that were so soon to cut the Roman Church off from primitive and truly Catholic conceptions of the consecration and use of the Eucharist.

The council that met at Rome in 1079 A.D. were for the most part of the opinion that the Eucharist was consecrated "through the words of the sacred prayer and the consecration of the priest, by the unseen operation of the Holy Spirit." [3] This *modus* of expression was entirely congruous with the old tradition of the Church, but the phrase exacted from Berengar ran thus: "I Berengar with my heart believe and with my mouth confess, that the bread and wine, which are placed upon the altar, through the mystery of the sacred prayer and the words of our Redeemer, are substantially changed into the true and proper and life-giving Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ." [4] Now while this added phrase might mean no more in itself than that the words of Christ were a con-

[1] See Appendix, p. 387.
[2] See above, p. 142.
[3] See Appendix, p. 387.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 387.

tributing factor in the consecration, yet in the mind of Berengar's opponents it meant clearly more than that. Thus Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers († 1088 A.D.), in a letter addressed to Berengar, after quoting the Narrative of Institution as it stands in the *Canon Missae*, says: "By the power and efficacy of His word, by which all things were made, the bread, after the sacring of the priest consecrating by these words, we believe and confess to be the true Body of Christ, and the wine, in like manner, to be His true Blood." [1] Guitmund of Aversa uses the phrase "through the words of the Saviour," [2] and Durandus of Troarn explains our Lord's command as follows: "'Do this.' What is the meaning of 'Do this'? It is, 'Make this Body, this Blood, by My words, by My invocation.'" [3]

When we read what Berengar himself wrote, as the mature opinion of his later years, in his treatise *Of the Holy Supper*,[4] we realize not only that he held a positive and strong view of the Eucharistic Presence, but also (and with this we are more immediately concerned), that his view of the *Canon Missae* and of the rationale of its framework was in accord with the older, and primitive, tradition of the Church. Not only does Berengar quote in full S. Augustine's description of the consecration of the Eucharist contained in the Third Book of his treatise *On the Trinity*, which speaks of it as "consecrated by the mystical prayer" and "sanctified by the unseen operation of the Spirit of God"; [5] but his frequent reference to parts of the *Canon Missae* and his detailed comment upon it contain plain evidences that he was contending also for the ancient tradition of the Western Church (which others were leaving rapidly behind them), in regard to the hallowing of the

[1] See Appendix, p. 388.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 388.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 388.
[4] *De Sacra Coena*, edited by A. F. and F. Th. Vischer, Berlin, 1834.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 268.

sacramental elements, and to the *Supplices te* as the Invocation proper of the Latin Liturgy. Against the crude materialistic notions of his opponents, Berengar calls the *Canon Missae* as a witness[1] and points out repeatedly that while it is full of petitions to God to accept and bless the elements offered, yet there is no hint in it that they are to be changed by destruction of their substance into a *portiuncula carnis*, as the view of his attackers required.[2] He proves this not only from the prayer as a whole, but also from a consideration of its several parts. It is "the prayer (of some length) poured forth by every priest according to the Roman use."[3] Again and again he speaks of "the prayer,"[4] "the priestly prayer,"[5] "the priestly supplication."[6] The priest prays for the "advancement and the exaltation," of the elements "to a higher condition,"[7] to "greater efficiency and honour,"[8] and this through God's "acceptance and blessing."[9] In his comment upon *Unde et memores* (with the commentary of Rabanus Maurus upon the same passage evidently before his mind), Berengar plainly states that in this (= *The Oblation*) there is offered bread, properly so called, and adds: "Now this can be hallowed by the prayers of the priests."[10] Again, in his comment upon the *Supra quae* he maintains that it is the Church's memorial offering of bread and wine which is compared to the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek.[11] In *Supplices te* the highest "advancement"

[1] *De Sacra Coena*, pp. 277–282. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 84–85, 133–134, 231–235. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 277–282 *passim*.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 277. "Ab omni sacerdote oratio more Romano Domino sub silentio prolixior funditur."

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 278, "Oratio." [5] *Ibid.*, p. 281, "Prex sacerdotalis."

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 279, "Deprecatio sacerdotalis."

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 277, "Provectio in melius et sublimatio."

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 278, "Ad majores effectus, ad majorem provexeris dignitatem."

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 279, "Per acceptationem et benedictionem Domini."

[10] See Appendix, p. 387. [11] *Op. cit.*, pp. 280–281.

or "exaltation," namely "to the heavenly altar of God," is requested for the bread and wine. In the light of the tradition of the undivided Church, and of his own words, Berengar, in spite of his weakness when hard pressed by his enemies, stands forth in his latest utterances as an isolated champion of earlier and more truly Catholic belief regarding the consecration of the Eucharist. The crude materialism of the majority (who, as Berengar was fond of pointing out, are not by any means infallible)[1] prevailed in the Western Church, and marking out Christ's words of administration as the means and moment of consecration, exaggerated the simple mimetic act of picking up the bread and cup[2] in the recital of *Qui pridie* by prolonging it and by raising the elements aloft, as an act of protest against what this materialism called the heresy (!) of Berengar.[3] The twelfth century saw the spread of this notion. Forgetting that these words were rehearsed in an historical narrative, to show the warrant for the Church's obedient observance in the paragraphs that follow, in the *Canon Missae*, and forgetting that the Church had always applied Christ's words of declaration and administration in her own delivery of the consecrated elements, when she said to each communicant, "This is the Body of Christ," "This is the Blood of Christ," and stupidly alleging that Christ was speaking His own words through the celebrant, in contradiction even to the plain grammatical construction of the *Canon Missae* (as of all other liturgies), each

[1] *De Sacra Coena*, pp. 27, 34, 39, 44–45, 54–55, 58.

[2] Cf. De Vert, *op. cit.*, Vol. I., pp. 250; Vol. III., pp. 261–264; especially Vol. IV., pp. 186–195, 199–208, 209–217, 220.

[3] There has been, of late, entirely too much repetition of the phrase, "the heresy of Berengar," upon the part of those who would fain produce the impression that the doctrine of the Real Presence and that of Transubstantiation are synonymous, and who therefore strive to bring in all the late Roman ceremonial of *Qui pridie* under the pretext that by so doing they are only safeguarding the doctrine of the Real Presence.

element was lifted up while the words of Christ were repeated, and a definite moment of transubstantiation was asserted. With the theological difficulties and subtleties that soon rose in the wake of this innovation, we are not here concerned. It is merely of interest to our present inquiry to trace the further developments of ceremonial that followed the introduction of this new elevation, until the present ceremonial praxis accompanying the recital of *Qui pridie* was reached. Before doing this, however, it may be interesting to note one or two evidences of the hold that the old understanding of the *Supplices te* had upon men's minds even after the newer ideas were well established. For example, Alger of Liège († c. 1131 A.D.) in his *Of the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, Book I., Chap. XIV., writes: —

"Wherefore also the priest as Christ's minister consecrating the Lord's Body upon the earthly altar, and yet not assigning anything to his own merits, but all to the power and grace of God, prays in the Canon to God the Father saying, 'Command that these oblations be carried to Thee by the hands and power of Thy Son, Thy Angel, who is the Angel of Great Counsel, not to this lowly and visible altar, where now it is, but to Thy altar on high, that is Thy Son, whom Thou hast exalted to Thy right hand, in the sight of Thy majesty, that it may become to us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son:' showing that the Son Himself, by the command of the Father, is in heaven offering, and is both the sacrifice and that upon which it is offered." [1]

Again, Peter Lombard († 1164 A.D.) says on the one hand: —

"The form indeed is that which He gave saying, 'This is My Body,' and afterward, 'This is My Blood.' For when these words are uttered the conversion of the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of

[1] See Appendix, pp. 392–393.

Christ takes place. The rest [of the Canon] is said for the praise of God." [1]

On the other hand, when discussing whether heretics can consecrate the sacrament, he decides negatively, saying: —

"And Augustine [?] also seems to lay this down, saying: Consider the name and note the truth. For it is called *missa* in that the heavenly messenger comes to consecrate the life-giving Body, according to the utterance of the priest saying: *Almighty God, command that these things be carried up by the hands of Thy holy Angel to Thy heavenly altar*, etc. Therefore unless the Angel come, by no means can it be called *missa*. For if a heretic dared to undertake this mystery, would God send His Angel from heaven to consecrate his oblation?" [2]

Even Durandus († 1296 A.D.), although he does not accept this interpretation following, says of the *Supplices te*: —

"In a second manner also the words aforesaid can be expounded, thus: *Almighty God, command that these things*, that is the bread and wine, understood, *be translated*, that is transmuted, *to Thy heavenly altar*, that is into the Body and Blood of Thy Son, above the choirs of angels to be exalted, because the Lord's Body is called an altar according to that saying: 'An altar of earth shall ye make Me.' *By the hand* of *Thy holy Angel*, that is by the ministry of the priest." [3]

The very fact that Durandus thought it worth while to mention this understanding of the *Supplices te*, if only in order to reject it, shows how deep-seated was the tradition that the *Supplices te* was the Invocation proper of the Roman rite, and the equivalent of the Epiklesis of all other liturgies.

If we retrace our steps for a moment, we find in the

[1] See Appendix, p. 393. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 393.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 394.

Roman rite of the eighth and ninth centuries, among the ceremonial acts by which the *Canon Missae* was accompanied, in the course of the recital of *Qui pridie* a picking up of the bread and of the cup at the words in that narrative, "He took bread," "He took the cup," and also the sign of the cross made over each separately as the words "He blessed it" were repeated of our Lord's acts in respect of each element at the first Eucharist. These acts illustrated the reading over of the warrant given by Christ to His Church to keep His memorial, which charter is appropriately quoted as the prelude to our obedient observance. Moreover this simple ceremonial continued without alteration until the close of the eleventh century. For the notion of consecration as effected primarily by the recitation of Christ's words of declaration to His disciples spread slowly and, of course, affected the traditional ceremonial of the Church only after getting a foothold strong enough to do so. The *Micrologus* shows us the same old-fashioned way of celebrating the Eucharist as obtained hitherto.[1] We should note also that these same mimetic gestures during the recitation of the Narrative of Institution are to be found in Eastern Liturgies as well.[2]

Let us then note the steps of the change wrought by the new doctrine of consecration in post-Berengarian times. Bruno of Segni († 1123 A.D.) states the new teaching as clearly as need be, as the starting-point for our further inquiry.

"'He spake and they were made, He commanded and they were created.' So therefore also now when He said: 'This is My Body'; and 'This is My Blood'; so great was the potency of His word, that instantly both the bread was changed into His Flesh, and the wine into His Blood." [3]

[1] See Appendix, pp. 374–375.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., pp. 51–52, 176–177, 232.

[3] See Appendix, p. 389.

"Behold, the priest forever after the order of Melchizedek by His ineffable power converts the bread and wine into the substance of His Body and Blood." [1]

"He spoke then for Himself: He speaks now through His ministers; 'This is My Body.' And so great is the power and efficiency of His word, that forthwith what is said is done. Likewise moreover when He says: 'This is My Blood,' thereupon the wine is converted into His Blood." [2]

Compare with this the dictum of Odo of Cambray († 1113 A.D.) as another example of the same reasoning (or lack of it).

"Take away the words of Christ, the sacraments of Christ are not made. Do you wish the Body and Blood of Christ to be made, apply the utterance of Christ. The utterance of the Truth does what He says: for 'He spake and they were made, He commanded and they were created.' Without doubt there is done in the creature what Christ's utterance says of the creature. For almighty is Thy utterance, O Creator. Therefore by the utterance of Christ His Body and His Blood are made." [3]

Honorius of Autun († 1120 A.D.) states this same notion without intimating that there has been any change in the ceremonial, as yet.

"We take the bread into our hand, and we bless it (*i.e.* sign it with the cross), and we denote the time of grace when Simeon took Christ, Who was born the Living Bread, into his hands and rejoiced and blessed. Then we pick up the cup, and bless, and we express the time of the supper, when Christ picked up the bread and cup in His hands, and blessed, and then delivered His Body and Blood to His apostles. Wherefore now first when the words of the Lord are recited in their order, the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord." [4]

[1] See Appendix, p. 389.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 389.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 388–389.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 389–390.

The next step in the development of the later ceremonial is to be found in the continuance of the act of "picking up," each element being held aloft until after the utterance of Christ's words, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," in either case. Hildebert of Tours († 1133 A.D.) gives us a clear description of this stage of the ceremonial.

"This is conferred entirely in those words which the priest subjoins, not his own, but those of the Lord. For he is about to recite what He pronounced, or did, when taking supper, He, the same, became a blessed supper Himself.

Who the day before He suffered, took bread.

Bread, as yet common, at this word is taken from the altar, and [the priest] having taken it, holds it with both hands. Thereafter the presbyter when he comes to 'He blessed it,' imprints upon what he holds the mystical sign of the cross. Nor does he put it down upon the table, before, repeating Thy words, O Christ, he utters them over it.

Take and eat ye all of this.

Then he lifts the chalice and signs it, nor does he replace it, before he reiterates over it the words of the Institutor, thus: 'Take and drink ye all of it,' as far as, 'unto remission of sins.' And if in this we may trust the fathers, while life eternal lasts, that is made food of the soul, which until now was food of the flesh. That by these words, both acquire new powers and greater than their own, approved writings teach. Under the cross, under the word, their nature is made new, and the bread honours the altar with Flesh and the cup with Blood. And so the presbyter, when he comes to those words whereby so great grace is granted to the altar, lifts up each, marking that it is higher than common foods, and that it carries with it something greater." [1]

[1] See Appendix, p. 390. Cf. Sicard of Cremona, Appendix, p. 394.

Similarly, Stephen of Autun († 1139 A.D.) tells us:—

"And this which the priest prays for, namely that the oblation of bread and wine may become the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, was first done when the disciples were at supper, in these words pronounced by Christ: 'This is My Body,' 'This is the cup of My Blood of the New and eternal Covenant.' But before the priest pronounces these words, he continues the sequel to those that precede, saying: 'Who the day before He suffered took bread into His holy and venerable hands, and with eyes lifted up to heaven, to Thee, O God, His Father Almighty, giving thanks to Thee,' etc. While he pronounces these words he takes the bread from the altar, and while it is lifted up he blesses it by making the sign of the cross, and afterwards, having duly recited and having repeated the words of the Lord, he puts it down upon the corporal. Then he lifts the cup, and signing it, repeats the words of the Lord, saying: 'He blessed it, He gave it to His disciples saying: Take and drink ye all of this, This is the cup of My Blood,' etc. O extraordinary miracle! O wonderful and most divine sacrament! What mind is not awed? What understanding does not fail? All perception is too dull, all reason vanishes. Let the prying of logic keep far away. Faith alone proves and knows this, that the food of men is become angels' food. What the priest lifts up, he does not put down. That which is taken up and that which is put down seem to be the same in kind, colour, and taste: nevertheless it appears one thing, and another within lies hid. Common bread is picked up from off the altar, the immortal Flesh of Christ is put down. What was animal food has been made spiritual food. What was the temporary refreshment of men, has been made the eternal and unfailing satisfaction of angels." [1]

A treatise ascribed to Hugo of S. Victor († 1141 A.D.) follows the phraseology of that of Hildebert of Tours

[1] See Appendix, p. 391.

quoted above, yet as it adds one slight touch, it will be cited here.

"And this is entirely bestowed in those words of the Lord that were pronounced at His supper, which the priest subjoins. But about to say these he thus first begins: 'Who the day before he suffered.' At these words he takes the bread, as yet common, from off the altar, and holding it up blesses and prints upon it the sign of the cross, and before he puts it down, he repeats the words of the Lord while he says: 'He blessed it and brake it,' and what follows. Afterwards he lifts the cup and signs it, and repeats the words of the Lord, saying: 'And He gave it to His disciples saying: Take and drink ye all of this.' Here takes place an extraordinary miracle. At these words food of the flesh becomes food of the soul. By these words and by the sign of the cross nature is made new, and bread becomes Flesh and wine becomes Blood. Wherefore rightly when he comes to these words by which so great grace is given, the priest lifts each *aloft*, marking out this food and this drink to be of more excellence than other." [1]

Here we appear to have a slight addition to the ceremonial, which may be inferred from the words of Hildebert of Tours, but which he does not explicitly state; namely, that after having picked up either element and having signed it while he held it, in addition to keeping hold of it until after the repetition of our Lord's words, the celebrant raised each element *higher still* as he said the words referring to each. This marks the transition to the next stage of the ceremonial development, when a further distinction was made by differentiating between the *picking up* of the bread and cup where it is said, "He took bread," "He took the cup," and the lifting of them up quite high *after* the words, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," respectively had been said.

[1] See Appendix, pp. 391–392.

When we come to the ancient Statutes of the Carthusians (c. 1150 A.D.), we find ourselves in an atmosphere quite different from that of the time of the earliest Roman *Ordines* and Amalarius. The new notion of consecration by the mere repetition of our Lord's words has taken complete possession of the ceremonial of the *Canon Missae,* so that men have come to regard the rest of the Canon as a mere setting to the (supposed) consecration wrought in the course of the recitation of a few words in one paragraph of it alone. A physical miracle is now believed to be performed by the priest saying: *Hoc est enim corpus meum, Hic est calix sanguinis mei,* etc. Hence a bell is to be rung after these words have been said, to call the congregation to a special worship not possible till that moment.

"Having said the preface, the priest bows before the altar, and says, *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,* etc., *Te igitur,* etc., as far as *benedicas.* Then he rises, and makes the crosses as they are arranged in the missal. At *Qui pridie quam pateretur,* when he says: *Accepit panem,* he takes the host in both hands, lifts it a little, and blesses it in its place. If there are more hosts, as he says: *Benedixit,* with one sign he signs both the one he holds and the other also. Having said *Hoc est corpus meum,* the host is elevated so that it can be seen, and the bell is rung one stroke, or more in purely conventual masses. Now at the elevation of the host we prostrate ourselves to the ground, if we are praying standing, as when *Et homo factus est* is said, nor do we rise until the cup is put down . . . At *Simili modo* when it is said *Accipiens et hunc praeclarum calicem,* he takes the cup with both hands, he lifts it a little, having first drawn back the corporals somewhat and holding them back between his fingers and the rim of the cup, lest they fall. Having said *gratias agens,* he puts it down, but does not remove his left hand. Having made the cross at *benedixit,* he takes hold again of the cup with both hands,

and lifts it up a little, and holds it elevated as far as *Unde et memores Domine.*" [1]

It is noteworthy that as yet the chalice is not treated with quite the same regard. That is again a later development. For the present we may note some traces of the promulgation of the pattern set by the Carthusians, throughout the rest of Western Christendom.[2]

Among the directions given by the Synod of Paris (1197 A.D.), under Odo, is this: —

"It is commanded to presbyters, that when they have begun *Qui pridie* in the *Canon Missae,* holding the host, they do not elevate it too high at once, so that it can be seen by all the people, but hold it about opposite their breast, until they have said: 'This is My Body:' and that then they elevate it so that it can be seen by all." [3]

Here we see that it is found necessary to regulate the previous elevation, which was in origin a prolonging of the mimetic act of picking up the bread and cup. The vague attempt at emphasis upon the words, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," in the interests of a crude Capharnaite view of the Eucharistic Presence in opposition to Berengar, has been refined upon, and therefore, the edict must go forth to time the elevation exactly in accordance with the development of doctrine. What an utter novelty the whole thing is, is entirely obvious from the provisions of synods in this (thirteenth) century that the people be taught to bow or kneel at the elevation of the host. For if there had been a single shred of genuine tradition for

[1] See Appendix, p. 395.

[2] At the same time we should note that although the Carthusians led in the introduction of the new ceremonial of the elevation of the host in the twelfth century, yet the later developments of ceremonial (during *Qui pridie*) have not been adopted completely by them. Their rite to-day is conservative in comparison with the ceremonial stereotyped and made authoritative for the Roman Church at large by the Pian Missal of 1570 A.D.

[3] See Appendix, pp. 395–396.

either the innovation of a new idea of consecration, or for the attendant ceremonies that grew around it, it stands to reason that a series of enactments couched in almost the same words would not have been required in widely separated parts of European Christendom. If it had been the custom of the Church to ring a bell at the time the priest said "This is My Body," and if the faithful had always believed the bread to be consecrated by that recital, why all this setting forth of directions now for this diocese, or province, now for that?

Thus we find among the *Additions* of William of Paris to the *Constitutions of Gallo* (1208 A.D.):—

"It is commanded, that in the celebration of masses, when the Body of Christ is elevated, at the very elevation, or a little before, a bell be rung, as was otherwise ordered; so that thus the minds of the faithful might be stirred up to prayer." [1]

Again, the *Constitutions* of Richard Poore, Bishop of Salisbury (c. 1217 A.D.), direct that:—

"The laity be admonished, that they behave themselves reverently at the consecration of the Eucharist, and kneel: especially at the time when after the elevation of the Eucharist, the sacred host is put down." [2]

Again Pope Honorius writes to the prelates of Ireland (1219 A.D.) to this effect:—

"Let each priest frequently teach his people, that when in the celebration of masses the saving host is elevated, each reverently bow, doing the same when the presbyter carries it to the sick." [3]

In the *Statutes* issued by Stephen Langton (Archbishop of Canterbury) at the Council of Oxford, 1222 A.D., we read:

"Let the laity be admonished frequently, that wherever they see the Body of the Lord carried, at once they kneel as to their Creator and Redeemer, and with joined hands

[1] See Appendix, p. 396. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 396.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 396.

pray humbly until it has passed, and that this be done especially in the time of consecration at the elevation of the host, when the bread is transformed into Christ's true Body, and that which is in the cup into His Blood by the mystical benediction." [1]

At a Provincial Council of the Scottish Church, 1225 A.D., it is ordered:—

"Let them not moreover elevate the host before these words are pronounced: 'This is My Body.'" [2]

At a Provincial Council of Trèves, 1227 A.D., it is provided:—

"Likewise let the host not be elevated for the people before the words of transubstantiation." [3]

Among the Precepts of the Synod of Rouen, 1235 A.D., we find:—

"It is commanded to presbyters, that when they have begun *Qui pridie* in the *Canon Missae* holding the host, they do not elevate it: but keep it opposite their breast, until they have said: 'This is My Body.' And then let them reverently and carefully elevate it, so that it can be seen." [4]

At the Synod of Worcester, 1240 A.D., we find Walter of Cantilupe ordering the ringing of a bell at the elevation by those monastic bodies who had not hitherto done so.

"When moreover in the celebration of mass the Body of the Lord is raised on high by the hands of the priests, let a bell be rung; so that by this the devotion of the sluggish be roused, and the love of others be the more strongly inflamed. And we command this moreover to be observed as to the elevation, by those religious who have not thus far kept this statute, so that it can be seen by those present." [5]

The Synodical Statutes of Walter and Simon, Bishops of Norwich, 1257 A.D., order:—

[1] See Appendix, pp. 396–397.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 397.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 397.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 397.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 398.

"Moreover let each priest frequently teach his people, that when in the celebration of masses the saving host is elevated, they reverently bow." [1]

In 1261 A.D. the Provincial Council of Mayence gives order:—

"Moreover let each priest diligently teach his people, that when in the celebration of masses the saving host is elevated, each one devoutly kneel, or at least reverently bow, doing the same when the presbyter carries it to the sick." [2]

In 1268 A.D. the Synod of Clermont provides:—

"And let not presbyters when they begin *Qui pridie* in the *Canon Missae* elevate the host, but hold it carefully opposite their breast, until they have said, 'For this is My Body': and then let them elevate it, and let them keep it elevated so long that it can be duly seen: and then let the bell be rung. Now this is laid down, lest mere bread be adored: which might happen, if it should be elevated before the utterance of those words." [3]

The Council of Munster in Westphalia, 1279 A.D., decrees:—

"Likewise let no priest elevate the host to show it to the people, except after he has said these words, 'For this is My Body': and let the bell be rung three times, so that the faithful who hear, wherever they may be, may worship." [4]

The Synod of Cologne, 1280 A.D., repeats this direction practically verbatim; [5] and in 1287 A.D. the *Synod of Exeter* ordains, in words which will appropriately close our citations in illustration of the gradual promulgation of the new doctrine of consecration as it crystallized and the new ceremony of elevation and adoration immmediately after the utterance by the priest of the words, "This is My Body," which it developed in its train:—

[1] See Appendix, p. 398.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 398.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 398–399.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 399.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 399.

"Moreover because by these words, 'For this is My Body,' and not by any others, the bread is transubstantiated into the Body of Christ: let the priest not elevate the host, until he has fully pronounced those very words, lest for the Creator, a creature be worshipped by the people.

"Moreover let the host be so elevated aloft, that it may be gazed upon by the faithful standing around; for by this the devotion of the faithful is roused, and faith receives a merited increase. Let parishioners be anxiously exhorted, that at the elevation of the Body of Christ, they not merely reverently bow, but kneel, and worship their Creator, with all devotion and reverence, to which by the stroke of a bell let them be roused at first: and at the elevation let a larger bell be struck three times." [1]

We have now to consider the next development in the overthrow of the old tradition of the Western Church. It is obvious, if the people are ordered to worship the host as supposed to be consecrated after the recitation of the words, "This is My Body," and if a bell is to be rung to call them to this new duty, that sooner or later the priest himself would be affected by this new condition of things and begin to do what he was commanded to teach the people to do. We are not then surprised to find in *Ordo Romanus XIV.*, written by Cardinal James Cajetan during the pontificate of Clement VI. (1342–1352 A.D.), a direction for the celebrant to worship by bowing his head after the recitation of "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood" respectively.[2] The ceremonial prescribed for *Qui Pridie* is as follows:—

"Then saying *Qui pridie*, etc., let him wipe the thumb and index finger of each hand lightly upon the corporal, and let him take the host with his fingers; neither let him lift it much above the altar: in saying moreover *elevatis oculis in caelum*, let him lift his eyes: and in saying

[1] See Appendix, p. 400.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 400–403.

benedixit, let him make the sign of the cross with his right hand over the host, which he holds with his left hand: and this done, let him again hold the host with the fingers of both hands, and pronounce clearly and devoutly the words of consecration: and these said, let him first worship with bowed head the sacred divine Body: then reverently and carefully let him elevate it on high to be worshipped by the people, and after it has been worshipped let him put it down in its place. . . . Having put down the host, as was said, in saying *Simili modo*, etc., let him take the cup uncovered, as before, let him hold it with both hands slightly elevated above the altar, and when he says, *benedixit*, having put down the cup upon the altar, let him make the sign of the cross over the cup with his right hand, as he holds it with his left, and this done, taking it again with both hands, and elevating it a little from the altar, let him proceed with the words of consecration as far as that place, *remissionem peccatorum*. And these finished, with head a little bowed let him worship the sacred Blood of the Lord, and let him elevate it to be worshipped by the people, as was laid down above concerning the Body. Neither is it necessary that he hold either the Body or the Blood elevated a long time; but after a short interval let him put it down, nevertheless so that he make the elevations and replacings with due reverence and deliberation. Moreover as he is putting down the cup let him say these words: *Haec quotiescumque*, etc. And having put down the cup, and having set it in its place, with his hands raised as before, let him proceed with *Unde et memores*, etc." [1]

This continued for over two hundred years to be the authorized ceremonial of the Roman rite. But a further development took place, and was stereotyped for the churches of the Roman obedience in the Missal of Pius V. 1570 A.D.[2] Not satisfied with bowing his head after

[1] See Appendix, pp. 401–402. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 410–411.

each supposed consecration, the celebrant took to bending his knees, instead of, or along with, the bow. This was in fact a sort of crouching down into practically a kneeling posture. Thus a kneeling down of short duration, a genuflection[1] as it is called, came to be substituted for the bow, and by the end of the fifteenth century was probably customary in many places, yet without explicit sanction. In the text of the *Exposition de la Messe* of Jean de Vignay, reproduced by the Alcuin Club from a manuscript of the last part of the fifteenth century (c. 1480 A.D.),[2] we have a description of the ceremonial of the mass following closely the Roman rite of the time of de Vignay (*i.e.* the first half of the fourteenth century). The pictures with which the illuminator has illustrated the treatise, however, show us the celebrant crouching down, in the later fashion which must have been as familiar to him as it was unknown to Jean de Vignay or to Cardinal Cajetan when he framed *Ordo Romanus XIV*. This new gesture was recommended by John Burckard in his *Ordo Missae*, in 1502[3]

[1] No impartial observer can be convinced for long that there is really more reverence expressed by the quick sinking upon one knee only to rise at once, than by the bowing of the head and body. On the contrary, the rapid genuflection seems rather like a mockery, than like an act of profound worship, and the more it is multiplied (as in the modern Roman rite), the less does it seem to be inspired by the spirit of true devotion.

[2] Alcuin Club Collections, II., *Exposition de la Messe* from *La Légende Dorée* of Jean de Vignay. Edited by W. H. Frere, London, 1899. See especially pp. 12–13; and Plates 7, 8, 9 (opp. p. 34).

[3] See Appendix, pp. 406–407. Cf. the ceremonial prescribed in the *Indutus Planeta* (see Appendix, p. 408), a series of directions contained in many editions of the Roman Missal (chiefly printed in France) between 1507 and 1546. This last does not go beyond *Ordo Romanus XIV.* (*q.v.*). Even the *Directorium Divinorum Officiorum* of Ludovicus Ciconiolanus, published at Rome with the approval of Pope Paul III. in 1539, recommends the genuflection in a way that shows it to have been anything but a universal gesture at that time. (See Appendix, pp. 408–409.) An interesting

to be made both before and after each elevation in *Qui pridie,* and since the publication of the Pian Missal mentioned above, this has become obligatory upon the clergy of the Roman obedience.[1] In England the bow or inclination of the head was all that was authorized [2] up to the time of the Reformation, although it is evident that in Cranmer's time the genuflection was in use as an exaggeration of the lawful ceremonial.[3] The elevation of the bread and cup was abolished in the Prayer Book of 1549,[4] this abolition carrying with it logically all the ceremonies that had followed in its wake. Moreover (as we shall see in the next chapter) the appeal of the English Reformation to the early and undivided Church was made good at last, in the revision of the Prayer Book for the American Church in 1789, by a return to the Eastern, and truly Catholic, teaching and practice in regard to the consecration of the Eucharist (which had once been the use of Western Christendom as well), thus precluding forever any *honest* reintroduction of the mistaken Roman theory and ceremonial.

trace of the progress of the new gesture is seen in the rubric at the close of *Qui pridie* in an edition of the Roman Missal published at Paris in 1555. (See Appendix, pp. 409–410.)

[1] With the exception of a few privileged religious orders.

[2] See Appendix, p. 412.

[3] Note especially Thomas Becon, *The Displaying of the Popish Mass* (Parker Society, 1844), pp. 260, 270, 275, 276, 283; cf. also *A Comparison between the Lord's Supper and the Pope's Mass,* pp. 359, 385.

[4] See above, p. 2. The gestures authorized in 1662 (and still retained in the American Prayer of Consecration) are purely mimetic in their significance. See above, pp. 7–9.

CHAPTER V

THE RESTORATION OF THE EPIKLESIS IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION, 1549–1789

We must now trace the course of the gradual awakening of Anglican theologians to a knowledge of primitive teaching and practice in the matter of the consecration of the Eucharist, and to an appreciation thereof, a process that issued finally in the introduction of the Oblation and Invocation in their proper ancient order, into the Prayer of Consecration in the American Communion Office. Our starting-point is, of course, the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI., 1549. For this book Archbishop Cranmer wrote practically a new prayer to take the place of the Latin *Canon Missae*. In this he made some changes of order. The commemorations of living and dead he combined and made to precede the Consecration. The *Supplices te* (the ancient Invocation *par excellence*, as we have seen) he watered away, and placed an Invocation of the Holy Spirit before the Narrative of Institution, in the position of the preliminary Epiklesis (*Quam oblationem*) of the Latin Canon. In this Invocation he put a mention of the "word"[1] also, making a kind of compromise between the Eastern and the (then prevailing) Western views. The Greek Liturgies were accessible to Cranmer, both in the original and in translations, and he was probably influenced by them. Moreover, even if they had not been directly known to him, the difference between the Eastern

[1] Bishop Dowden in *The Workmanship of the Prayer Book in its Literary and Liturgical Aspects*, London, 1899, pp. 48–49 and 51–53, shows the probable reasons for Cranmer's compromise in this matter, as expressed in his own words.

and Western Churches upon this question was well known to every theological scholar. With all his cleverness in combining the two divergent views, Cranmer was evidently not satisfied in his own mind, and the fact of attempted compromise is marked upon the face of the Invocation. The fact that with the naming of the Holy Spirit he associated the "word," is obviously a compliance with the common Roman notion that the recitation of *Hoc est corpus meum* is the essential and effectual means of consecration. The fact also that he made this new form of Invocation to be said before the rehearsal of the Narrative of Institution, shows his unwillingness to seem to cast any aspersion upon that current Thomist[1] view. "Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech thee: and with thy holy spirit and word, vouchsafe to bl✠ess and sanc✠tify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." This hesitating mode of expression soon gave way to a far more radical departure from the Latin rite (and from all antiquity) in the Second Book of 1552. In this, not to speak of any other excisions, the Invocation in the Prayer of Consecration is reduced to the weak, indefinite form (still retained in the English Book of Common Prayer), "Hear us, O merciful father, we beseech thee, and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood."

In order to understand the significance of the changes made in the Prayer of Consecration in the Book of 1552, we must examine the Lutheran use in this matter, in

[1] Cf. Le Brun, *Défense*, etc., Paris, 1727, Article III., pp. 57–89. Duns Scotus, although accepting likewise *Hoc est enim corpus meum* as the "form" of the Eucharist, did not ignore the rest of the *Canon Missae*. See Appendix, pp. 403–404.

view of Cranmer's intimate knowledge of the course and the principles of the (then) recently effected German Reformation.[1] In the year 1532 Cranmer was in Germany, on his errand as ambassador to the Emperor from King Henry VIII. While stationed at Ratisbon, where the Emperor made a long stay that year, Cranmer made visits to Nürnberg to see the Elector of Saxony. At Nürnberg he had abundant opportunity to observe all the changes in the Church service wrought by the Reformation since 1524. Here Cranmer met and saw much of Osiander, who, with John Brentz, was at that time engaged in preparing the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Kirchen-Ordnung of 1533. From this quarter we may also believe that Cranmer drew part of the emphasis he laid upon the "word," in the sense of Christ's statement, "This is My Body," in the short-lived Book of 1549. For at the bidding, first of Carlstadt,[2] and afterward of Luther,[3] the entire Canon of the Mass had been cut away with the exception of the Narrative of Institution. In the violence of their reaction against the abuses of the traffic in masses, they had excised any and all idea of sacrifice in connection with the Eucharist, and had done away with any petition for God to consecrate the elements, and said or sang aloud merely the *Verba Testamenti*, *i.e.* the bare Narrative of Institution. It is but just, however, to these reformers to recall that in thus blotting out the whole of the prayers and commemorations of the *Canon Missae*, they were simply carrying to its logical conclusion that tendency of Western Christendom to overemphasize more and more the recital of our Lord's words in the Canon of the Mass, which exaggeration in the course of a few hundred years had wrought such radical changes in the understanding of that

[1] See Jacobs, *The Lutheran Movement in England*, revised edition, Philadelphia, 1894, pp. 45–48, especially p. 47.

[2] See Appendix, p. 413, for Carlstadt's scheme of reformed Mass.

[3] See Appendix, pp. 414–415, for Luther's *Formula Missae*.

same Canon, and of the interrelation of its parts one to the other. This trend is perhaps best summed up in the words of Henry de Segusia, Cardinal Hostiensis, who says, "The Canon of the Mass is taken for those words of Christ, by which the transubstantiation of the bread into the Body and the wine into the Blood is effected. Although some unlettered priests understand as the Canon whatever is in the Secret of the Mass."[1] On which Lyndwood comments: "And understanding Canon strictly, I think what Hostiensis says is true. For Canon is the same as rule. . . . Wherefore that rule by which the Eucharist is consecrated is called the Canon of the Mass, *i.e.* the rule of those words whereby the bread is transubstantiated into the Body and the wine into the Blood."

How strongly Cranmer was impressed by the Lutheran rite is seen in the experiments, obviously on German lines, which he made after the Order of Communion was put forth (March 8, 1548), and before the issuing of the First Book of Common Prayer in the following year. We have record of one occasion in particular that shows a remarkable parallel to the distinctively Lutheran type of service. "On the 12th day of May [1548], Henry VII.'s anniversary was kept at Westminster, the Mass sung all in English, with the Consecration of the Sacrament also spoken in English, the priest leaving out all the Canon after the Creed[2] save the Paternoster, and ministering the Com-

[1] See Appendix, pp. 413–414, for the original.

[2] The meaning of this expression "after the Creed" is not quite clear. It may refer to the "Lesser Canon" so called (see Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, second edition, London, 1876, p. 412 and note 3), *i.e.* to the offertory prayers which were cut out entirely by the Lutheran Reformers, and hence in the case before us we have an account of a service completely upon Lutheran lines. It is also possible that "Creed" is a mistake for "Qui pridie," which last, spoken quickly, would sound like "Creed"; and hence we may have a service more on the lines of the Book of 1549, *i.e.* with an Invocation (in this case *Quam oblationem*) before the Narrative of Institution, and all that "smacked of oblation" after the Narrative excised.

munion after the King's Book." [1] This, taken in connection with the fact brought out in the Parliamentary Debate on Monday, December 16, 1548, that the title "Oblation" was in the draft of the First Prayer Book but omitted in that Book as issued for use, certainly goes far to prove that Cranmer was following German models as closely as he dared.

We must not forget, however, that there are some evidences to be found among the earlier German Kirchen-Ordnungen of a more conservative spirit than that shown in Luther's own use. The "Evangelical Mass" of Kaspar Kantz of Nördlingen, first published in 1522,[2] not only contains an Invocation before the Narrative of Institution but also expressly includes this Epiklesis under the title, "Now first begins the Evangelical Mass." [3] The Invocation itself runs as follows: "O Father all-pitiful, merciful, everlasting God, grant that this bread and this wine become, and be to us, the true Body and the pure Blood of Thy well-beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. Who on the day before his passion," etc. The more widely known Pfalz-Neuberg Kirchen-Ordnung of 1543 is also one of the rare exceptions to the Lutheran type. It has the following Epiklesis (remarkable as being addressed to the Second Person of the Trinity), "Lord Jesus Christ, Thou only true Son of the living God, who hast given Thy Body unto bitter death for us all, and hast shed Thy Blood for the forgiveness of our sins, and hast bidden all Thy disciples eat Thy Body and drink Thy Blood in remembrance of Thy death; we place these gifts of bread and wine, which Thou Thyself hast given, before Thee, and beseech Thee, through Thy divine grace to hallow and bless them,

[1] Wriothesley's Chronicle, II., p. 2. Camden Society, 1877.

[2] See Smend, *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen bis zu Luthers Deutscher Messe*, Göttingen, 1896, pp. 38–41 and 72–94.

[3] See Appendix, pp. 415–416. Cf. the Low German version, Appendix, pp. 416–417; and also a Strassburg order of 1524, Appendix, p. 417.

and make this bread and this wine to be Thy Body and Blood, and to serve unto eternal life unto all them that eat and drink thereof. Who with God the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest for ever and ever. Amen."[1] The Narrative of Institution is then sung by the minister, with the elevation of both host and chalice. How far Cranmer was acquainted with these more conservative Lutheran Kirchen-Ordnungen cannot be determined. We cannot even be sure that he knew them at all. In the light of his close relation to the German Reformation, however, it is at least worthy of note that a weak quasi-epiklesis in the Book of 1552 was retained before the Narrative of Institution when all the rest of the Prayer of Consecration in the Book of 1549 was cut away.

Of this fact we are sure, however, that Cranmer was well acquainted with a book written by the Chapter of Cologne Cathedral, and laid before their Archbishop, February 3, 1543, in answer to, and in criticism of, his own *Deliberatio*, in which he had proposed and had set forth a Liturgy on the strictest Lutheran lines, drawn from the following Kirchen-Ordnungen: Brandenburg-Nürnberg, 1533; Herzog Heinrich, 1539; and Hesse-Cassel, 1539. Cranmer, in one of his note-books,[2] makes so many references to the *Antididagma*[3] of the Canons of Cologne that it is evident that he was well acquainted with their trenchant criticism of their Archbishop's proposal to consecrate the Eucharist by the simple recitation of 1 Cor. xi. 23–25. Herman, for example, says in his *Deliberatio:* "Immediately after this [the Sanctus] let the words of the Lord's Supper be sung by the Priest in German: Our Lord in the night in which he was betrayed, etc. These words

[1] See Appendix, pp. 418–419.

[2] British Museum, Royal MSS. 7 B. xi. See *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. XXXI, No. 62, pp. 419–437 (January, 1891).

[3] For full title see Appendix, p. 419.

ought to be sung by the Priest with the greatest care, and distinctness, so that they may be well understood by all. And the people shall respond to these words, Amen. This was observed by the whole ancient Church, and is observed to the present time by the Greeks. For there is contained in these words the whole substance of this Sacrament; and that it be not only administered but also received, to the soul's health, that entire thing lies in the true understanding of these words." [1] Against this mistaken notion the Chapter argue very temperately yet most cogently, putting forth for themselves what may be best described as the Scotist view on this point. Their position can be clearly seen from the following extracts. Under the head, "Of the Consecration of the Eucharist, and the third Sacrifice of the Mass," [2] they say: "The sacrifice of praise which is offered for the state of the whole world having been completed, there follows the chief part of the mass, that is the consecration of the most divine sacrament. . . . In this consecration the priest, in the name of the Church, through the invocation of God, which is founded entirely on His promise and the command of His Son, humbly prays, that God may vouchsafe to make that oblation of bread and mingled wine placed before Him, which has been offered in token of our entire surrender and thankfulness, in all respects duly blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. And forthwith the priest pronounces the words of the Evangelists: 'Who the day before He suffered,' and so forth. To which immediately he subjoins the divine words of Christ, by the power of which that most honorable and most sacred sacrament of His Body and Blood is consecrated and made: THIS IS MY BODY together with the

[1] See *Church Quarterly Review* (already referred to), Vol. XXXI., No. 62, pp. 432–433 (January, 1891).

[2] See Appendix, p. 420.

other divine words which are uttered over the chalice." Again, under the caption, "Whether without the Canonical Prayer of the Church the Sacrament is consecrated," they say: "Here necessity demands that we declare it to be raging madness, that some now think they consecrate the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, without the Catholic prayer which we call the Canon, and without the invocation of the Divine Name over the gifts presented but only by recital or reading of the words of Paul, 1 Cor. xi., 'The Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed,' etc. Though the Apostle in that place is only narrating historically the acts which Christ did: not in order to hand down any form of consecrating, by which the priest, the Church's minister, with invocation of the Divine Name might bless and sanctify the offered gifts, and not with his own words, but with the omnipotent words of our Lord Jesus Christ." [1] After a few words upon the fact of the tradition of the Eucharistic prayer, they proceed to make the following pertinent illustration: "Nor is it difficult to prove this in a similar matter, by the form of the other sacraments. Christ taught his apostles to baptize, saying: 'Go ye and baptize all nations, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Who then is of so dull apprehension, as dares to say, that a priest who recites or reads the words of the Gospel concerning the institution of baptism, who moreover does not utter the words of the essential form of baptism: 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' truly and validly baptizes a child? Especially since the priest doing this would not follow out the Church's office of ministry, nor say anything in reference to the child, but merely be reading the words of history. Nor would he be performing an embassy for Christ, as though God were baptizing through him, but only recounting a thing done. So plainly also in this case it is

[1] See Appendix, pp. 420–421.

necessary to think, that if any one recite or read only the history of the institution of this sacrament, as it is recorded in Paul, he would not as the minister of the Church invoke the name of God over the gifts of bread and wine presented, nor direct the words of consecration to the oblation present, — such an one by no means consecrates, or makes a true sacrament according to the sense and tradition of the Church Catholic. Far otherwise thought and did the holy fathers of the Church Eastern and Western. Yea also the Apostles, for they as ministers of the Church invoked the name of God over the oblation, and consecrated it by a solemn prayer." [1] After quoting authorities to support their position, the Canons of Cologne close the discussion of this point thus: "One utterance only of the most venerable Irenæus has it pleased us to add to what has been said. For he in his fourth book, chapter thirty-four, says that 'the bread which receives the invocation of God, becomes the Eucharist,' etc. In very truth they who have not the Canon, who neither invoke God, nor direct the words to the gifts presented, and therefore do not consecrate, but only read the historical words of the Apostle Paul, whereby he narrates Christ's institution, not moreover in the manner Paul himself was wont to pronounce the words over the bread and wine, when he consecrated the Body and Blood of the Lord, — how can it be said that they consecrate?" [2] We can thus see how cautious Cranmer was likely to be in carrying out his liturgical projects. For he was of course acquainted with the more conservative, Scotist view of consecration of the Eucharist, which laid much emphasis upon the saying of the whole Canon of the Mass, [3] and he had also examined the question as raised by Herman von Wied, and as opposed by his own Cathedral Chapter. For in spite of all the influence brought to bear by Bucer and Peter Martyr, Cranmer

[1] See Appendix, p. 421. [2] See Appendix, pp. 421–422.
[3] See Le Brun, *Défense*, etc., pp. 66–67.

nevertheless retained an implicit Epiklesis in the Book of 1552, although all that "smacked of oblation" was cut ruthlessly away. Thus the Church of England, though well-nigh losing touch with primitive and truly Catholic practice, was preserved by a narrow margin from the novel and peculiarly Lutheran use. It is this indirect quasi-invocation which really constitutes the Prayer of Consecration in the Book of 1552 (and in all the subsequent English Books of Common Prayer) a Prayer of Consecration at all.[1] Without it we would have merely a statement that God had redeemed the world by the sacrifice of His Son, who had also ordained a memorial of the same, this statement being illustrated by the narrative appended. The promise of a return to early practice in regard to the consecration of the Eucharist, held out by the Book of 1549,

[1] The restoration in 1662 of provision for the taking of the paten at "He took bread," and the other mimetic gestures, does not alter the narrative character of the rehearsal of the account of the Institution. On the contrary, such illustrative acts do but emphasize the historical nature of the recital.

With the English Prayer of Consecration (1552–1662) may be compared the Reformed Episcopal use, which will be found on p. 422 of the Appendix. The meagreness of the English form is, perhaps, most clearly seen from an anecdote in Mr. Athelstan Riley's *Athos or the Mountain of the Monks*, p. 73 (London, 1887). "This morning O—— celebrated the Anglican Liturgy, the Archbishop [of Cavalla], the archimandrite Baphides, and several monks of the highest dignity being present at their own request. Afterwards, during breakfast, the Archbishop turned round to us and said, 'Your liturgy is the liturgy of S. Gregory Dialogos.' We ventured to doubt this exalted origin, and replied that we had every reason to believe it was compiled by certain excellent gentlemen who lived in the sixteenth century; but the Archbishop was not to be contradicted.

"'No,' said he; 'I have studied it carefully, and it is the liturgy of S. Gregory Dialogos, and a very good liturgy too.'" In other words, the Invocation in the present English Book is so very weak, that the Archbishop had made up his mind that the English Liturgy was a liturgy of the Pre-sanctified!

and almost blighted in the Book of 1552, went long unrealized. At the opening of Elizabeth's reign there would seem to have been some proposal made to go back to the Book of 1549,[1] but this suggestion, if we may judge from Guest's letter to Cecil (or to some other member of the Privy Council), was opposed by him and by others and was defeated in Committee. The Invocation in the Prayer of Consecration in the Book of 1549 was an object of special dislike. The weak Epiklesis of 1552 was retained in the Book of 1559, however, and remains in the English Book to this day, a bulwark against any mere barren memorialism.

We must note briefly now the growing appreciation of earlier practice in the matter of Eucharistic consecration, upon the part of English theologians, in spite of the impetus that Cranmer gave to the notion that the Church of England was committed to the so-called "Western" view, when he excised from the Invocation all explicit mention of the Holy Ghost and all direct petition for the sanctification of the elements, in 1552. For this reactionary tendency is shown in the twenty-first canon of 1603,[2] and also remains embedded in the rubric governing the consecration of additional bread or wine, inserted in the English Book of 1662.[3] At best it must be acknowledged that Cranmer's attempt at compromise left a legacy of doubtfulness to the English Church in this particular. Thus Bishop Andrewes (1555–1626) in his *Preces Privatae* inserts an Invocation to be used at the offertory, "Thou that sittest on high with the Father, and art here invisibly, come and hallow the gifts that are set forth, and them for whom and them by whom and the ends whereunto they are brought."[4] At

[1] Cf. *The Church Times* for May 9, 1902, p. 579; and the *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. LIV., No. 108 (July, 1902), pp. 342–347, in correction of the view advanced by Dr. Gee in *The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments*, London, 1902.

[2] See Table IV., 2, p. 17. [3] See Table IV., 4, p. 17.

[4] Edited by the Rev. F. E. Brightman, London, 1903, p. 122.

the same time we find him asking in his Visitation Articles of 1619: "Whether doth he [the Minister of the Parish] use any Bread and Wine newly brought, before the words of Institution be rehearsed, and the Bread and Wine present on the table?" [1] And likewise in his Visitation Articles of 1625, he asks, "Whether doth he use the words of Institution every time that the bread and wine is received?" [2] Nevertheless he closes his Whitsunday Sermon, May 19, 1616, as follows: "And there is no better way of celebrating the feast of the receiving the Holy Ghost than so to do, with receiving the same body that came of It at His birth, and that came from It now at His rising again. And so receiving it, He That breathed, and He That was breathed, both of Them vouchsafe to breathe into those holy mysteries a Divine power and virtue, and make them to us the bread of life, and the cup of salvation; God the Father also sending His blessing upon them, that they may be His blessed means of this thrice-blessed effect! To Whom all, three Persons, etc." [3]

Dr. Richard Crakanthorp (1567–c. 1624?) in his *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, etc., Chap. LXXII and LXXIII,[4] treats very thoroughly of the whole question, showing an intimate acquaintance with the patristic and early practice, with the position maintained by the Greek Church, and by the Roman writers who had combated the extreme Thomist view. He declares, *e.g.*, that Christ consecrated by His blessing, Chap. LXXII., sec. 9: "In the next place, see how easy and how clear is our explanation of Christ's words: Christ took bread; He blessed the bread; by that blessing or prayer He consecrated it to this holy, sublime, heavenly, and mystic use, that it should be a symbol not only signifying but effectual, and bestowing His Body to believers instrumentally but spiritually.

[1] *Minor Works, A.C.L.*, p. 115. [2] *Minor Works, A.C.L.*, p. 132.
[3] *Sermons, A.C.L.*, Vol. III., p. 279. [4] *A.C.L.*, pp. 476–536.

Of this bread thus blessed, consecrated, and by Christ's blessing changed (which by force of truth the vanquished Bellarmine acknowledges, 'He gave blessed bread, and changed by the blessing'), of the bread, I say, thus changed from ordinary and common use to this holy and heavenly use, He said, 'This is My Body; this which I have taken, which I have broken, which I have consecrated, which I have given to you to eat, this is My Body.'" [1] He also gives, with his approval, Chap. LXXII., sec. 25–37, an admirable summary of the arguments of Cheffontaines, and puts himself on record as an adherent of the truly Catholic belief as to consecration of the Eucharist by God's answer to our prayer for that end.

Bishop Thomas Morton (1564–1659) in his treatise, *Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Bodie and Blood of Christ (by some called) the Masse of Christ,* says: "The first transgression of the (now) church of Rome, in contradicting Christ his canon, is collected out of these words, 'and he blessed it,' which concern the consecration of this sacrament. First of the bread the text saith, 'he blessed it': next of the cup it is said, 'when he had given thanks'; which words in your own judgments, are all one as if it should be said, he blessed it with giving of thanks. By the which word, blessing, he doth imply a consecration of this sacrament. The canon of the Romish Mass attributeth the property and power of consecration of this sacrament only unto the repetition of these words of Christ, 'This is my body,' and 'this is my blood,' etc." [2] Bishop Morton in his discussion refers to Cheffontaines, to the *Antididagma,* to Cabasilas, and to the Fathers, and reasserts his position from time to time with renewed emphasis. "These words therefore are of declaration, and not of invocation. Which now Romish doctrine of consecrating by reciting these words, 'This is my body,' etc.

[1] *A.C.L.,* p. 480.

[2] Quoted in Brett's *Dissertation* (edition of 1838), pp. 184–185.

your divines of Colen have judged to be a fierce madness, as being repugnant both to the Eastern and Western Churches." [1] "Nevertheless, this our conclusion is not so to be interpreted, as . . . to exclude out of the words of this celebration the repetition and pronunciation of these words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood of the New Testament.' Far be this from us, because we hold them to be essentially belonging to the narration of the institution of Christ, and are used in the Liturgy of our Church: for although they be not words of blessing and consecration (because not of petition but of repetition), yet are they words of direction; and withal significations and testifications of the mystical effects thereof." [2]

Hayward, a nephew of Bishop Overall, in notes written in an interleaved Prayer Book of the date 1619, says: "That there is to be a certain form of words wherewith the Sacrament is to be made and consecrated, we make no doubt; and therefore it is but a calumny of theirs that say we do nothing else but *recitare historiam*, tell the story of Christ's Institution, and so go to it. For we have first the recitation of Christ's command to have His Death and Passion remembered; and then we have a prayer to perform it as we ought to do. After that we have the words of consecration, as fully and amply as any priest whatsoever can or may use them." [3] And again, "When the Latins say that the Sacrament was consecrated by prayer, they mean not by every prayer; but either mean the whole action or whole service of the Church; or else they mean this form of consecration, which was always recited in the form of a prayer, as now it is." [4] Thus he takes a middle course, at the same time he does not slur over the quasi-epiklesis, but rather emphasizes it, as contained in the Prayer Book on which he is commenting.

Bishop John Cosin (1595–1672), in a series of notes and

[1] Brett's *Dissertation* (1838), p. 186.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 188.
[3] In Cosin's *Works, A.C.L.*, Vol. V., p. 106.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

collections in an interleaved Prayer Book of the date 1638, writes, "Thence arising, the celebrant, by prayer and recitation of the words of the Lord wherewith He instituted His holy Supper, consecrates the bread and wine placed before him with due reverence into the Sacrament."[1] In the same series of notes he states that the Prayer of Consecration "consists of a commemoration of the unique sacrifice offered once for all by Christ upon the cross, of the history and institution of the Sacrament, together with prayer that along with the blessed bread and wine we may be partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ."[2]

In his *History of Transubstantiation*, Chap. V., sec. 5, we read: "Likewise our blessed Saviour, having sanctified the elements by His words and prayers, gave them to His disciples as seals of the New Testament," etc.[3] In the second chapter of the same work, sec. 3, he says: "The priest also, blessing or consecrating the bread and wine, saith thus: 'Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood: Who in the same night,'" etc.[4] By so phrasing the statement, Bishop Cosin clearly shows that he felt the force and need of the Invocation.

It is interesting to recall, in this connection, that in the Cosin Library at Durham there is a Prayer Book (printed in 1619) containing alterations in Bishop Cosin's handwriting. According to these the Invocation would read as follows: —

"Heare us, O Mercifull Father, we most humbly beseech

[1] Cosin's *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. V., p. 304; cf. Vol. IV., p. 359. "Deinde, sese erigens, per preces solennes institutionem Sacramenti et ipsa Christi instituentis verba continentes, panem in manus acceptum frangens, vinumque in calicem effundens, utrumque symbolum benedicit, atque in Sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Christi consecrat."

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. V., p. 332.

[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. IV., p. 58 (180).

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 19–20 (158).

thee [and] vouchsafe[1] by the powers of thy holy word and spirit vouchsafe[1] so to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and Creatures of Bread and wine, that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of him, and to shew forth his death, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood."[2]

Bishop William Forbes (1585?–1634), in his *Considerationes Modestae*, devotes the first three sections of the second chapter of the second book *"Of the Eucharist"* to the question, "By what words the consecration of the Eucharist is effected." He says: "All the more sound Protestants admit that the words by which the Eucharist is consecrated ought to be consecrative and not merely homiletic; that is, that they ought not to be spoken for the mere purpose of instructing the people, but also, nay rather, in order to consecrate the Eucharist. But the greater part altogether deny that the consecration is performed by these words and these alone, 'THIS IS MY BODY,' and 'THIS IS MY BLOOD,' as Romanists contend against the Greeks. For they think that the consecration is effected not by these words of Christ alone, but by the mystical prayer also whereby the descent of the Holy Ghost is implored, that He may sanctify the elements; and so by the whole service in so far as it is performed, both by the minister and the communicants, according to Christ's institution. The Scripture, it is true, favours more the opinion of Protestants, and very many of the

[1] Note the repetition, probably unintentional, of the word "vouchsafe."

[2] See Parker's *Introduction to the History of the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*, Oxford and London, 1877, pp. xciii and ccxiii. Cf. also pp. xcvi, ccxi, and ccxxvi for the (almost identical) form in Sancroft's "Fair Copy," 1661. Cf. also Bishop Dowden's *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, pp. 286–289. Cf. also the form adopted by the Maryland and Pennsylvania Conventions of 1786. See below pp. 235–238, and Appendix, pp. 434–436.

Fathers say repeatedly that the elements are consecrated by prayer and invocation." [1] Cassander is then quoted at length to support this position, likewise Cheffontaines, the Archbishop of Spalatro, and Erasmus. Lindanus, the writers of the *Antididagma*, Bishop Morton, and Vossius are also mentioned as upholding the Greek contention. Bishop Forbes, after quoting his authorities, closes this subject thus: "And let these things suffice upon this strife, in which nothing should be defined hastily and as if it were of faith." [2]

Archbishop Bramhall (1593–1663), in his treatise *The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops justified*, says: "They who are ordained Priests, ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, to make Them present after such manner as They were present at the first institution; whether it be done by enunciation of the words of Christ, as it is observed in the Western Church, or by prayer, as it is practised in the Eastern Church; or whether these two be both the same thing in effect, that is, that the forms of the Sacraments be mystical prayers, and implicit invocations. Our Church for more abundant caution useth both forms." [3]

Bishop Jeremy Taylor (1613–1667) gives us his opinion, on the subject under consideration, in several of his writings. The following brief extracts will serve to illustrate it: "After supper Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and made it to be a heavenly gift: He gave them bread, and told them it was His body; that body, which was broken for the redemption of man, for the salvation of the world. S. Paul calls it bread, even after consecration; 'the bread which we break, is it not the communication of the body of Christ?' so that by divine faith we are taught to express our belief of this mystery in these words: The

[1] Vol. II. (*A.C.L.*), pp. 530–531. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 536–537.
[3] *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. III., p. 165.

bread, when it is consecrated and made sacramental, is the body of our Lord: and the fraction and distribution of it is the communication of that body which died for us upon the cross. He that doubts of either of the parts of this proposition must either think Christ was not able to verify His word, and to make 'bread' by His benediction to become to us to be 'His body'; or that S. Paul did not well interpret and understand this mystery, when he called it 'bread.'" [1]

"The Greek fathers, and divers of the Latin, do expressly teach that the consecration of the elements is made by the prayers of the church recited by the bishop or priest. For the scripture tells us that Christ took the bread, He blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to them, saying, Take eat. It is to be supposed that Christ consecrated it before He gave it to them; and yet if He did, all the consecration was effected by His benediction of it. And if (as the Romanists contend) Christ gave the sacrament of the Eucharist to the two disciples at Emmaus, it is certain there is no record of any other consecration but by Christ's blessing or praying over the elements. It is indeed possible that something more might be done than was set down, but nothing less; and therefore this consecration was not done without the benediction; and therefore *Hoc est corpus meum* alone cannot do it; at least there is no warrant for it in Christ's example." [2]

"Now I demand, what did Christ's blessing effect upon the bread and the chalice? any thing, or nothing? If no change was consequent, it was an ineffective blessing, a blessing that blessed not: if any change was consequent, it was a blessing of the thing in order to what was intended,

[1] *The Life of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, Part III., § XV., Discourse XIX., 2, *Works*, edited by Eden, ten vols., London, 1859–1865, Vol. II., pp. 637–638.

[2] *A Dissuasive from Popery*, Book I., § VII., 3, *Works*, edited Eden, Vol. VI., p. 481.

that is, that it might be eucharistical, and then the following words, 'This is My body, this is the blood of the New testament,' or 'the New testament in My blood,' were, as Cabasilas affirms, ἐν εἴδει διηγήσεως, 'by way of history and narration'; and so the Syriac interpreter puts them together in the place of S. Matthew, εὐλογήσας and εὐχαριστήσας, 'blessing' and 'giving of thanks' when He did bless it He made it eucharistical." [1] "To which I add this consideration, that all words spoken in the person of another are only declarative and exegetical, not operative and practical; for in particular, if these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, were otherwise, then the priest should turn it into his own, not into the body of Christ." [2] "When all the office of Christ's priesthood in heaven is called 'intercession for us,' and Himself makes the sacrifice of the cross effectual to the salvation and graces of His church by His prayer, since we are ministers of the same priesthood, can there be a greater glory than to have our ministry like to that of Jesus? not operating by virtue of a certain number of syllables, but by a holy, solemn, determined, and religious prayer, in the several manners and instances of intercession: according to the analogy of all the religions in the world, whose most solemn mystery was their most solemn prayer: I mean it in the matter of sacrificing; which also is true in the most mysterious solemnity of christianity, in the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper, which is hallowed and lifted up from the common bread and wine by mystical prayers and solemn invocations of God." [3]

"What the priest does here, being an imitation of what Christ does in heaven, is by the sacrifice of a solemn prayer, and by the representing the action and passion of Christ,

[1] *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament*, etc., § IV., 6, *Works*, edited Eden, Vol. VI., pp. 43–44.

[2] *Op. cit.*, § IV. 8, *Works*, edited Eden, Vol. VI., p. 45.

[3] *Clerus Domini*, or *A Discourse of the Divine Institution . . . of the Office Ministerial*, § VII., 5, *Works*, edited Eden, Vol. I., p. 45.

which is effectual in the way of prayer, and by the exhibiting it to God by a solemn prayer and advocation, in imitation of, and union with Christ. All the whole office is an office of intercession, as it passes from the priest to God, and from the people to God; and then for that great mysteriousness, which is the sacramental change, which is that which passes from God unto the people by the priest, that also is obtained and effected by way of prayer." [1]

"The Greek churches, which have with more severity kept the first and most ancient forms of consecration than the Latin church, affirm that the consecration is made by solemn invocation alone, and the very recitation of the words spoken in the body of a prayer are used for argument to move God to hallow the gifts, and as an expression and determination of the desire. . . . The church of England does most religiously observe it according to the custom and sense of the primitive liturgies; who always did believe the consecration not to be a natural effect, and change, finished in any one instant, but a divine alteration consequent to the whole ministry: that is, the solemn prayer and invocation." [2]

We note with much interest that these opinions of Bishop Taylor's found special outlet in the form of service which he set forth for use while the Book of Common Prayer was under the ban of the Commonwealth. In *An Office or Order for the Administration of the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the Way of the Apostolical Churches, and the Doctrine of the Church of England,* we have the following Invocation:—

"Have mercy upon us, O heavenly Father, according to Thy glorious mercies and promises, send Thy holy Ghost upon our hearts, and let Him also descend upon these gifts, that by His good, His holy, His glorious presence, He may sanctify and enlighten our hearts, and He may bless and sanctify these gifts.

[1] *Clerus Domini, Works,* edited Eden, Vol. I., pp. 47–48.
[2] *Op. cit., Works,* edited Eden, Vol. I., pp. 48–49.

"That this bread may become the holy body of Christ.

"*Amen.*

"And this chalice may become the life-giving blood of Christ.

"*Amen.*

"That it may become unto us all that partake of it this day, a blessed instrument of union with Christ, of pardon and peace, of health and blessing, of holiness and life eternal, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

"*Amen.*" [1]

Herbert Thorndike (1598–1672) treats of the consecration of the Eucharist in more than one of his writings. He goes thoroughly into the subject, having made himself well acquainted with the patristic and liturgical aspects of the case. No English theologian, up to his time, has so completely and definitely worked out the whole matter. In his treatise *Of Religious Assemblies and the Public Service of God: A Discourse according to Apostolicall Rule and Practice*, printed in 1642, he says: "To me it seemeth unquestionable that the thanksgiving wherewith our Lord in the Gospel is said to have celebrated this Sacrament at His last supper, contained also prayer to God for the effect to which the elements, when they become this Sacrament, are deputed: and that the Church, upon His example, hath always frequented His institution with the like, rehearsing His institution out of the Gospel, and praying for the effect of it at the present, after the thanksgiving hitherto described: and so — whereas in the sense of the Church of Rome the elements are consecrated, that is, transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, by rehearsing the affirmative words of Christ, This is My body, this is My blood, as operative — in the true sense of the Church they are consecrated, that is, deputed to be this Sacrament, and to the effect of it, by the prayer

[1] *Works*, edited Eden, Vol. VIII., p. 624.

of the congregation, grounded upon the institution of Christ and the promise which it implieth." [1]

In his *Epilogue*, Part III., entitled *The Laws of the Church*, he devotes nearly all Chapter IV. to a most thorough examination of the question. For the sake of brevity, merely the first two sections will be quoted. "Coming now to consider wherein the consecration of the eucharist consists, I find no opinion on foot, but that which hath taken possession by the authority of the school-doctors; — that it is performed by the recital of these words, 'This is My Body, This is My Blood,' in the canon (that is, the canonical or regular prayer for the consecration of the eucharist) of the mass. For those that have set aside this prayer, and do not allow the opinion, that these words are operative to the effecting of that which the institution of the eucharist promises, though they retain the recital of them in the action, yet have not declared any common agreement, wherein they intend to maintain the consecration of the eucharist to stand.

"And is it not then free for me to declare, that I could never rest satisfied with this opinion of the school-doctors; as finding it to offer violence to common sense, and the truest intention of that which we may see done in consecrating the eucharist? For when our Lord takes the elements in His hands and blesses them (or gives God thanks over them), then breaks the bread, and, delivering them, bids His disciples take and eat them, because they are His Body and Blood; is it not manifest, that they are so called in regard of something which He had already done about them, when, delivering them, He calls them at that present time of delivering them, that which He could not call them afore, His 'Body and Blood?'" [2] His final opinion is thus expressed in the treatise *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of*

[1] Thorndike's *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. I. (Part I.), p. 342.
[2] *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. IV. (Part I.), pp. 50–51.

Trent, written within two years of his death: "The Greek Church holds, that consecration is done by the prayers of the Church: the Latin Church, by the words of our Lord 'This is My Body — This is My Blood of the New Testament'; which they call 'operating,' because the repeating of them they say makes the change. This conceit hath in it more appearance of magic, than of the word of God, if we take it as it sounds; which we have no reason to do. For the institution of our Lord being executed by celebrating the sacrament; and the celebration of the sacrament requiring a prayer, that the presence of the Body and Blood, which the institution promises, may be made good: what doubt is there, that this produces the effect? But by virtue of the institution; containing the narrative of what our Lord did, and commanded to be done. And therefore those words are to be repeated in celebrating the sacrament; not as 'operating,' but as signifying the promise which the precept insinuates, when our Lord says, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' For so are we assured, that the elements, which the Church consecrates, are the Body and Blood of Christ; as those were, whereof our Lord speaks. And therefore it was our Lord's 'blessing' or 'thanksgiving,' which made them so; according to an observation in my book, that εὐλογία and εὐχαριστία signifies no less than the celebration of the eucharist in the ancient fathers. What the thanksgiving used in the services, that are extant, was wont to contain, is there to be seen.[1] But it ended in a prayer; — that the Holy Ghost may come down upon the elements proposed, to make them the Body and Blood of Christ." [2]

Thorndike's opinion in reference to the Prayer of Consecration in the English Book is well worthy of our attention. "The prayer, which we consecrate with, seemeth

[1] Cf. *The Service of God at Religious Assemblies*, Chap. X., §§ 40–54, *A.C.L.*, Vol. I. (Part I.), pp. 337–349.

[2] *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. V., pp. 544–545.

agreeable to the intent of God's Church; but more agreeable in that form, which the first Book of Edward the VI. (revived by the Scottish liturgy) prescribeth."[1] Thorndike's learning was at the service of the Nonjurors afterwards, and he is constantly referred to by those of them who supported the Invocation (among the "usages"). His treatment of the subject will well repay a careful study to-day. The liturgical discoveries made since his time would alter merely a few of the details of his arguments, and would serve only to strengthen his position. The English theologians of the seventeenth century made a most profound and thorough study of the Eucharistic doctrine and practice of the early and undivided Church, and Thorndike's discussion of the question of consecration, *e.g.*, illustrates all that is best in English theological methods and results.

Bishop Thomas Wilson (1663–1755), in his *Sacra Privata*, without any desire to invalidate the English Prayer of Consecration, gives us further evidence of the strength of the feeling in favour of a more explicit Epiklesis. MS. iii. prefixes by way of title to the devotions for the 'Lord's Supper,' "Private devotions at the Altar, taken out of the most ancient offices of the Church; to render our present Communion-service more agreeable to Apostolic usage, and more acceptable (I hope) to God, and beneficial to all that partake thereof. Until it shall please Him to put it into the hearts and power of such as ought to do it, to restore to us the First Service of Edw. VI. Or such as shall be more conformable to the appointment of Christ and His Apostles and their successors. Which may the Divine Majesty vouchsafe to grant, for His sake Who first ordained this holy Sacrament. Amen."[2]

We also read a little farther on: "*Immediately after the*

[1] *Just Weights and Measures*, Chap. XXII., § 7, *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. V., pp. 245–246. Cf. Vol. I. (Part I.), pp. 380–382.

[2] Wilson's *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. V., pp. 73–74.

Prayer of Consecration. We offer unto Thee, our King and our God, this bread and this cup.

"We give Thee thanks for all Thy mercies, beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ: and that all we, who are partakers thereof, may thereby obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion." [1]

Hamon L'Estrange's *Alliance of Divine Offices* contains the following statements:—

"*Saying, Take eat, this is My body.* The recital of these words pass in the common vogue for a consecration; were I Romishly inclined, I should rather impute unto them the power of transubstantiation, for that a bare narrative can be qualified to consecrate is certainly new divinity, unknown to Scripture, and antiquity interpreting it. Therefore I must adhere in judgment to those learned men who derive consecration from the word of God and prayer, the very way by which our Saviour Himself sanctified those elements in His first institution, Matt. xxvi. 26, εὐλογήσας, 'calling upon God for His blessing,' and εὐχαριστήσας, 'giving thanks,' in which action it must be supposed that Christ had more than a general design of saying grace, as we phrase it, for those elements as creatures ordained for common nutriment, viz. an intention of invocating God's blessing upon them, in reference to those ends for which He meant by His institution, to separate and depute them. And though the primitive fathers, in the act of consecration, did usually join the narrative of Christ's institution with the words of blessing and thanksgiving, thereby as it were showing their commission; yet were they far from imagining that the elements were sanctified any other way than by prayer, if they must be thought (as sure none will question

[1] Wilson's *Works, A.C.L.*, Vol. V., p. 74, and notes "i" and "j"; cf. Vol. I. (Part II.), p. 972.

it) to mean as they said."[1] After quoting patristic and liturgical testimony, he concludes, "Now it were, I say, vain to prefix with the Latins, or to affix with the Greeks, such an invocation, if the bare affirmative words of our Saviour's institution were consecration all-sufficient."[2]

John Ernest Grabe (1666–1711), the well-known scholar, was so impressed with the meagreness of the English Prayer of Consecration that he did not like to receive the Holy Communion consecrated according to it, and preferred to receive the Sacrament at the hands of Bishop Hickes, who used the form prescribed in the First Book of Edward VI.[3] After his death a Latin treatise by him was published (together with an English translation of the same), entitled *De Forma Consecrationis Eucharistiae*, etc.[4] It would be interesting to quote from this work at length, but as its arguments have been covered already (in Chapter III.), it will suffice to quote briefly, from some *Papers* appended to this treatise, the grounds of its author's doubtfulness as to the validity of Eucharistic consecration by the form prescribed in the English Book of 1662.

"To the due Consecration of the Bread and Wine mixt with Water, as the Matter of this Sacrament, is required a determin'd special Form of Words, or Prayer, or both. I say, a special Form, and a determin'd one, if not in Sound,

[1] *A.C.L.*, p. 315. [2] *Ibid.*, p 317.

[3] See *The Doctrine of a Middle State . . .*, by Bishop Archibald Campbell, London, 1721, p 79. Cf. also Bishop Brett's *Dissertation* appended to his work *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies*, etc., London, 1720, pp. 357–358 (p. 404, edition of 1838). Cf. also the Preface to Whiston's *The Liturgy of the Church of England reduced nearer to the Primitive Standard*, London, 1713 (pp. 6–7, Hall's reprint).

[4] London, 1721. The English title, which very accurately describes the work, is: *A Defence of the Greek Church against the Roman, in the Article of the Consecration of the Eucharistical Elements.*

yet in Sense, perfect. For I do not think that a vague general Mention of Christ's Sufferings, and a Thanksgiving to God for them, with Prayer to make us Partakers of the Benefits of the same, will consecrate the Bread and Wine into Christ's Body and Blood, or make them a Sacrament of the same: At least I do not see, how any one can be so sure, as we ought to be in this Matter, that such a Thanksgiving and Prayer is valid and sufficient to the said Consecration. . . . If the Form, by which the Eucharistical Bread and Wine are made the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, were only the Words of our Saviour *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, rehearsed and pronounced over them by the Priest, as the Church of Rome, and some of the Protestants, especially the Lutherans, do teach; then no Objection could be made against the Form of Consecration of the H. Eucharist in the Church of England, since she expressly Commandeth and directeth in the Rubrick, that no Bread and Wine should be given to the Communicants as Sacramental, but over which the aforesaid Words have been pronounced by the Priest. But I have prov'd . . . that the Consecration of the Eucharistical Symbols is perform'd, not, or not only, by the Rehearsal of the aforesaid Words of Christ, but chiefly, if not only, by the Prayer of the Priest or Minister, as the Greek Church and some of the Protestants, especially those who are called Calvinists, (tho they wisely refuse this Denomination) do assert."[1]

"I am perswaded, I have proved . . . that the Primitive Fathers next to the Apostles Age, and much more downward, did believe, that the consecrated Bread and Wine were chang'd, if not in their Substance, yet in their inward Qualities; and that they not only represented and exhibited to the Faith of the Communicants the Body and Blood of Christ expired and pour'd out on the Cross; but that the Eucharistical Symbols themselves were verily

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 85–86.

made in a mysterious Manner the Body and Blood of our crucified Saviour. . . . And this Consecration or Sanctification of the Bread and Wine they believed was wrought by the Power of Almighty God and his Holy Spirit, who being invited and called down by the Prayer of the Priest, descended upon the Bread and Wine on the Altar, and enriched 'em with all the Virtues and Graces, with which the personal Body and Blood of Christ did abound, and so made them in this, and perhaps, in a yet more mysterious and incomprehensible Manner, to be verily the Body and Blood of Christ; as the Holy Ghost did formerly come upon the blessed Virgin, and formed in her Womb the personal Body and Blood of Christ.

"Now if this Belief of the Primitive Christians . . . be true, and if 1500 Years after, the Form of Prayer for the said Sanctification and sacramental Change of the Eucharistical Bread and Wine by the Power and Spirit of God, hath been changed upon the Disbelief of this mysterious Doctrine, not by Chance or base Ignorance; and if now, both the Priest Officiating, and the People communicating, do likewise disbelieve the same, or have no Notion of it at all, and consequently do neither desire in their Hearts, nor pray with their Mouths to God for such a Sanctification of the Bread and Wine by the Holy Ghost; yea, if they ask no Blessing at all upon the Bread and Wine, but only for themselves, namely, that they receiving outwardly those Elements, may at the same time inwardly by Faith receive the Body and Blood of Christ, or the Benefits of his Sufferings; in this Case, I say, it may reasonably be doubted, if not denied, that God doth bless and sanctify by his Holy Spirit the Bread and Wine, and make them the Body and Blood of Christ." [1]

"From all Testimonies and Monuments, 'tis plain, that all Tongues and Nations in all Ages of the Christian Church have called, and almost all still do call to God, for his

[1] Grabe, *op. cit.*, pp. 87–88.

blessed Spirit to bless and sanctify the Eucharistical Symbols of Bread and Wine. And as I do not question, that the self-same Holy Spirit hath directed them thereunto by his Apostles . . . and taught them how to Pray in the Celebration of the most Holy Sacrament; so I doubt very much (not to be positive and rash in Judgment) if a good Spirit hath abolished this solemn Prayer and Invocation of God for the Sanctification of the Eucharistical Elements; by which Omission the Consecration is made, if not void and null, yet uncertain and doubtful." [1]

Joseph Bingham (1668–1723), in his famous *Origines Ecclesiasticae* (Book XV., Chap. III., sec. 12), is also a plain witness. "Now this [the 'Form' of Consecration] anciently was not a bare repetition of those words, '*Hoc est corpus meum*, this is my body,' which for many ages has been the current doctrine of the Romish schools; but a repetition of the history of the institution, together with prayers to God, that He would send his Holy Spirit upon the gifts and make them become the body and blood of Christ; not by altering their nature and substance but their qualities and powers, and exalting them from simple elements of bread and wine to become types and symbols of Christ's flesh and blood, and efficacious instruments of conveying to worthy receivers all the benefits of his death and passion." [2]

The opinion of Charles Wheatly (1686–1742), in his *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*, must be given at length because of its pertinence and sobriety.

"Chapter VI., sec. xxii. — Of the Prayer of Consecration.

"The ancient Greeks and Romans would not taste of their ordinary meat and drink till they had hallowed it by giving the first parts of it to their gods: the Jews would not eat of their sacrifice till Samuel came to bless it: and

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

[2] Edition revised by the Rev. Richard Bingham (in eight vols.), London, 1834, Vol. V., p. 251.

the primitive Christians always began their common meals with a solemn prayer for a blessing: a custom so universal, that it is certainly a part of natural religion: how much more then ought we to expect the prayers of the Priest over this mysterious food of our souls, before we eat of it! especially since our Saviour himself did not deliver this bread and wine until he had consecrated them by *blessing them*, and *giving thanks*. So that this prayer is the most ancient and essential part of the whole Communion-office; and there are some who believe that the Apostles themselves, after a suitable introduction, used the latter part of it, from those words, *who in the same night*, etc., and it is certain that no Liturgy in the world hath altered that particular.

"§ 2. But besides this, there was always inserted in the primitive forms a particular petition for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Sacramental Elements, which was also continued in the first Liturgy of king Edward VI. in very express and open terms. *Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bl✠ess and sanc✠tify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, who in the same night*, etc. This, upon the scruples of Bucer, (whom I am sorry I have so often occasion to name,) was left out at the review in the fifth of king Edward; and the following sentence, which he was pleased to allow of, inserted in its stead; viz. *Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood: who, in the same night*, etc. In these words, it is true, the sense of the former is still implied, and consequently by these the elements are now consecrated, and become the body and blood of our Saviour Christ.

"In the rubric indeed, after the form of Administration, the Church seems to suppose that the Consecration is made by the words of Institution: for there it says, that *if all the consecrated bread and wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed; beginning at* Our Saviour Christ in the same night, etc. *for the blessing of the Bread; and at* Likewise after supper, etc. *for the blessing of the Cup.* This rubric was added in the last review: but to what end, unless to save the Minister some time, does not appear. But what is very remarkable is, that it was taken from the Scotch Liturgy, which expressly calls the words of Institution *the words of Consecration;* though the compilers of it had restored the sentence that had been thrown out of king Edward's second Common Prayer, and united it with the clause in our present Liturgy, imagining, one would think, that the elements were not consecrated without them. For though all churches in the world have, through all ages, used the words of Institution at the time of Consecration; yet none, I believe, except the Church of Rome, ever before attributed the Consecration to the bare pronouncing of those words only: that was always attributed, by the most ancient Fathers, to the prayer of the Church. The Lutherans and Calvinists indeed both agree with the Papists, that the Consecration is made by the bare repeating the words of Institution; the reason perhaps of which is, because the words of Institution are the only words recorded by the Evangelists and S. Paul, as spoken by our Saviour when he administered to his disciples. But then it should be considered, that it is plain enough that our Saviour used other words upon the same occasion, though the very words are not recorded; for the Evangelists tell us, that he *gave thanks, and blessed* the bread and wine: and this sure must have been done in other words than those which he spoke at the delivery of them to his dis-

ciples: for blessing and thanksgiving must be performed by some words that are addressed to God, and not by any words directed to men: and therefore the words which our Saviour spake to his disciples could not be the whole consecration of the elements, but rather a declaration of the effect which was produced by his consecrating or blessing them. And therefore I humbly presume, that if the Minister should at the consecration of fresh elements, after the others are spent, repeat again the whole form of consecration, or at least from those words, *Hear us, O merciful Father*, etc., he would answer the end of the rubric, which seems only to require the latter part of the form from those words, *who in the same night*, etc., be always used at such consecration."

I make no apology for so long a quotation. The temperate, judicial, well-balanced exegesis of Wheatly is too much neglected nowadays. He makes out the best case possible (when early practice and doctrine is taken into consideration), for a rite valid, but meagre.

We must now retrace our steps for a moment to consider the Prayer of Consecration in the Book of Common Prayer for Scotland, of 1637. In so doing we recall the fact that the explicit Invocation of the Holy Spirit in it, was not so repugnant to the mind of the Scottish Calvinists as we might carelessly suppose. Calvin in formulating his doctrine of the Eucharist laid great stress upon the work of the Holy Ghost, "by Whom, though the Body and Blood of Christ be in heaven, yet are they communicated truly to the worthy receiver."[2] Hence after a time his followers began to make provision for the Invocation of God's blessing upon the elements in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Thus in the Scottish Confession of Faith,

[1] *A Rational Illustration*, etc., Oxford, 1846, pp. 254–256.

[2] Cf. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. I., pp. 455–456, especially notes 1 and 2 on the last-mentioned page. Cf. also p 472.

1560, we have a mode of statement that makes for an explicit Invocation later. In Article xxi., "Of the Sacramentis," we read: "And alswa [wee beleeve], that in the Supper richtlie used, *Christ Jesus* is so joined with us, that hee becummis very nurishment and fude of our saules. Not that we imagine anie transubstantiation of bread into *Christes* body, and of wine into his naturall blude, as the *Papistes* have perniciouslie taucht and damnablie beleeved; bot this unioun and conjunction, quhilk we have with the body and blude of *Christ Jesus* in the richt use of the Sacraments, wrocht be operatioun of the haly Ghaist, who by trew faith carryis us above al things that are visible, carnal, and earthly, and makes us to feede upon the body and blude of Christ Jesus, quhilk wes anes broken and shed for us, quhilk now is in heaven, and appearis in the presence of his Father for us: And zit notwithstanding the far distance of place quhilk is betwixt his body now glorified in heaven and us now mortal in this eird, zit we man assuredly beleve that the bread quhilk wee break, is the communion of *Christes* bodie, and the cupe quhilk we blesse, is the communion of his blude." [1]

In the manuscript draft of a Liturgy, prepared in King James's reign, and sent up to London in 1629 [2] (if not earlier), we find the following Invocation in the Communion Office: "Mercifull father wee beseech thee that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy sonne our Saviour his holy institution, may be made partakers of his most blissed body and blood. Send doune o Lord thy blissing upon this Sacrament, that it may be unto us the effectual exhibitive instrument of

[1] Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. III., pp. 468–469. Cf. Craig's *Catechism* (1581), Schaff, *op. cit.*, Vol. I., p. 700.

[2] See *Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI.*, edited by the Rev. G. W. Sprott, Edinburgh and London, 1901, Introduction, pp. xxxvii.–xxxviii., xli., xlvi.

the Lord Jesus." [1] This Invocation is contained in a long prayer that leads up to and ends in the Lord's Prayer. After this follows the Narrative of Institution, preceded by the rubric: "*The prayer ended the Minister shall repeate the words of the institution for consecrating the elements and say,* The Lord Jesus the same night," etc.[2] This rubric has been rewritten on the margin in the following altered form, "*Then shall the Minister pray after this manner, and read the words of the Institution.*" Another hand has put this in, evidently to suit the views and practice of the anti-prelatical party, many of whom were in the habit of inserting an Invocation into the Book of Common Order when they used it.[3] Thus strangely enough the first impulse that led to the restoration of the explicit Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Book of 1637 came from a source whence we should not have been disposed to expect it. This draft was rejected and the Book of 1637 was prepared by Bishops John Maxwell of Ross and James Wedderburne of Dunblane, under the supervision of Archbishop Laud and King Charles himself. In this we have a return to the Invocation of the first Book of Edward VI., to which was added the latter part of the quasi-epiklesis of 1552, thus:[4] —

"Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son; so that we, receiving them according to thy Son

[1] Sprott, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 94. [3] *Ibid.*, notes, pp. 151–154.

[4] See Bishop Dowden's *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, pp. 25–42; Pullan's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 274–279; also *The Book of Common Prayer . . . for the Use of the Church of Scotland . . .* (1637), edited by the Rev. James Cooper, Edinburgh and London, 1904, Introduction, pp. vii.–xxxii., and Note H, pp. 265–272.

our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of the same his most precious body and blood."

A spirit of compromise with the then-prevailing Anglican view shows itself in the rubric for a second consecration,[1] yet the force of the Invocation is unmistakable.

Although this Book (of 1637) was swept out of use at once, and although the English Book of Common Prayer fared no better a few years later at the hands of the Parliament, yet even in the *Directory* put forth to take the place of the proscribed Books do we find evidence of an appreciation of the Invocation. "After this exhortation . . . the Minister is to begin the Action with sanctifying and blessing the Elements of Bread and Wine set before him . . . having first, in a few words, showed, That those Elements, otherwise common, are now set apart and sanctified to this holy use, by the Word of Institution and Prayer.

"Let the Words of Institution be read out of the Evangelists, or out of the first Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, chap. xi. 23, *I have received of the Lord*, etc., to the 27th verse, which the Minister may, when he seeth requisite, explain and apply.

"Let the Prayer, Thanksgiving, or Blessing of the Bread and Wine, be to this effect:—

". . . Earnestly to pray to God, the Father of all mercies, and God of all consolation, to vouchsafe His gracious presence, and the effectual working of His Spirit in us; and so to sanctify these Elements both of Bread and Wine, and to bless His own Ordinance, that we may receive by faith the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, crucified for us, and so to feed upon Him, that He may be one with us, and we with Him."[2]

[1] See Table IV., 3, p. 17.

[2] See *The Westminster Directory*, edited by the Rev. T. Leishman, Edinburgh and London, 1901, pp. 49–51, and notes, pp. 126–127.

Among the Exceptions made by the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference, to the English Book of Common Prayer, we find the following in reference to the "Prayer at the consecration," "We conceive that the manner of the consecrating of the elements is not here explicit and distinct enough." [1] This objection was one that was felt strongly by many others, such as Thorndike, and it failed of effecting an improvement in the Book of 1662, either because of that excessive caution so characteristic of the Anglican clergy, or because of an unwillingness to allow the imperfection of a form for which the Church party had so valiantly contended hitherto.

We should perhaps note, before going further, that although Archbishop Laud would have preferred to have had the English Book of Common Prayer used in Scotland, yet he approved of the Invocation in the Scottish Book of 1637. "'Tis true, this passage is not in the Prayer of Consecration in the Service-book of England; but I wish with all my heart it were. For though the consecration of the elements may be without it, yet it is much more solemn and full by that invocation." [2]

Although the Book of 1637 was rejected by the Presbyterians, and by the Church revisers of 1661–1662, the explicit

[1] See *Liturgia Expurgata*, or *The Prayer Book Amended according to the Presbyterian Revision of 1661*, etc., by Charles W. Shields, Philadelphia, 1864, p. 162; cf. pp. 121, 124–125. Cf. also Gillespie's *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies*, etc. (1660), Part 4, Chap. VII., § V., pp. 352–353.

For forms of Invocation now in use among Presbyterians, see Dowden, *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, pp. 270–271. Cf. also Professor Cooper's edition of the Book of 1637, Note H, p. 267, col. 4; and the *Euchologion, A Book of Common Order . . . issued by the Church Service Society*, last edition, Edinburgh and London, 1905, pp. 296–297; cf. pp. 290–292; cf. *The Book of Common Worship*, Philadelphia, 1905 (set forth for "voluntary use" by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., in that year), p. 78.

[2] Laud's *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. III., p. 354.

Invocation in the Prayer of Consecration bore fruit later through the Nonjuring school of theologians, who were untrammelled by any connection with the State and by any considerations of mere expediency. For it is owing to the theologians of this school, whether remaining in the Church of England, or separated from it, that the Scottish and the American Churches have returned to the primitive and Apostolic usage in the consecration of the Eucharist. To their writings and opinions on this subject we must therefore give due heed. They kept alive the tradition and practice of the early ages through a time of indifference and carelessness, and against strong and determined opposition. John Johnson (1662–1725) of Cranbrook forms a link between the Nonjurors and those theologians of the English Church, such as Thorndike, whom we have already quoted. One or two brief extracts suffice to show his position. "I apprehend that the Eucharistical Sacrifice, that is, the representative Body and Blood of Christ, were, by the primitive Fathers, supposed to be consecrated in a more perfect manner than any sacrifice under the Law could be: for in all the Liturgies, after the oblation of the Bread and Wine as the memorials of the grand Sacrifice, there is a solemn prayer that God would send His Spirit or His Divine benediction for the further consecration of them, after they had first been offered as a Sacrifice to God. And this is the most perfect consecration that inanimate creatures are capable of; and such a consecration does apparently best fit and comport with the Eucharist, as being the most eminent mystery and hierurgy that ever was instituted by Almighty God." [1]

"I now proceed to prove,

"3. That the ancients believed the consecration of the elements was finished by means of the prayer of invocation. And since I have already made it appear, that it is the Holy Spirit, Which consecrates the gifts, and makes the

[1] John Johnson's *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. I., p. 272.

true life-giving Body of Christ; and that in the primitive Church, the prayer for the descent of the Spirit to render the Bread the Body of Christ comes after the words of institution and the commemorative oblation, therefore the thing is in effect proved already; for if the elements were by either or both the former means fully consecrated, what occasion to invoke the Holy Spirit for the further consecration of them?" [1]

"One great and fundamental mistake of . . . writers on the same subject, both at home and abroad, is, a conceit that our Saviour blessed the Bread, only by saying, 'Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God and King, Who bringest forth Bread out of the earth;' and the Cup, by saying, 'Blessed be Thou, etc., Who createst the fruit of the vine.' The only grounds for this opinion are, that the Jewish Rabbies tell us, that their forefathers did by these words bless the bread and wine at their entertainments. The Christians of the Primitive Church by their constant practice have informed us, that they believed our Saviour to have blessed the Bread and Wine, not only by praising God for them, but by appointing them to represent His Body and Blood; by offering them to God as pledges of His Body and Blood, and by praying that God would enrich them with the Holy Spirit and make them His Body and Blood in life and power to the receivers." [2]

"The Invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the symbols was certainly thought necessary by the primitive Church; and if this were necessary in the primitive ages, it cannot be unnecessary now. I have fully proved, that this was the universal sentiment of all for some hundred years after Christ, and have showed what foundation this doctrine has in Scripture; and I have already in this chapter observed, that the Eucharist was designed to be One, as sanctified by the One Spirit. I think the generality

[1] John Johnson's *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. I., pp. 334–335.
[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. II., pp. 16–17.

of Protestants are agreed, that the Consecration is performed chiefly by prayer. In this the Lutherans and Calvinists seem united; and they do likewise generally esteem the rehearsal of the Words of Institution to be necessary to this purpose. The Lutherans do also speak very favourably of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, though it does not appear that they use it. The Church of Rome first laid aside this Invocation at the latter end of the sixth century, but it was still retained in the Gallican Liturgy, which was also used in the English Church till toward the middle of the eighth century; and from that time forward the Roman Liturgy prevailed in the whole Western Church, and the Holy Ghost was no longer invoked at the consecration of the Eucharist. The Greek and Eastern Churches do constantly and universally practise it to this day. Our first Reformers here in England restored this most pious and Apostolical Prayer (though they placed it before the Words of Institution, contrary to the ancient method); but in the review of our Liturgy, two or three years after, it was wholly omitted. It is clear, that the Church of Rome was the mother of this corruption; and I wish I could say that the Reformation had reduced our Liturgy to the primitive state in this particular." [1]

We now must briefly note the witness of the Nonjurors themselves. Bishop George Hickes (1642–1715), in the course of a comment on Romans xv. 15, 16, says: "I think that in mentioning that offering of his as being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, he plainly alludes to the ministration of the Christian sacrifice, in which they solemnly prayed unto God 'to send down His Holy Spirit upon the oblations'; without whom being specially present S. Cyprian thought the bread and wine could not be sanctified into the body and blood of Christ. . . . The ancient Church thought the Holy Spirit to be most espe-

[1] Johnson's *Works*, *A.C.L.*, Vol., II. pp. 209–210.

cially present at the Eucharistical sacrifice, and to be the chief agent in the ministration of it; who as Maximus and Cabasilas both express themselves, 'sanctifies the gifts by the hand and tongue of the priest.' The Holy Ghost then is the principal, and the priests but the instrumental ministers in the ministration of the Eucharistical oblation, *σύνεργοι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, co-agents or workers together with the Holy Spirit in the ministration of it. . . . From all that I have said, or cited out of the solemn prayers which were made to God in the administration of the Eucharist to send down His Holy Spirit upon the priest, the sacrifice, and the people, and from His mighty most special assistance, and chief ministration in the holy action, particularly in the sanctifying the oblations, I say, I cannot from considering all this but think it very probable, that the Apostle alluded to the common notion the Christians had of the Eucharistical oblations being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, in saying that the oblation he made of the Gentiles was acceptable to God, being (like the Eucharistical bread and wine) sanctified by the Holy Ghost." [1]

The thorough knowledge of early Christian practice in the consecration of the Eucharist, possessed by such men as Jeremy Taylor, Thorndike, John Johnson, and by the Nonjuring Bishops Hickes, Brett, Collier, Deacon, Campbell, and Rattray, found full expression for itself in the Nonjurors' Liturgy of 1718. This Liturgy, which was framed chiefly by Bishops Jeremy Collier (1650–1726) and Thomas Brett (1667–1743), in that part which corresponds to our Prayer of Consecration, follows the Greek Liturgy of St. James in the *Post Sanctus* and the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions in the Oblation and Invocation.[2] In the course of fruitless efforts for reunion with the Eastern Church, during the years 1716–

[1] Hickes's *Treatises*, *A.C.L.*, Vol. II., pp. 96, 98, 99.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 424–426.

1725, a Greek translation of this Liturgy was submitted to the Holy Synod of the Russian Church.[1] In this Liturgy the Nonjurors gave effect to their adherence to Catholic antiquity on the point under consideration, not only by inserting an explicit Invocation of the Holy Spirit, but by placing it in its proper position, *i.e.* after the Oblation.[2]

The opinion of Bishop Thomas Brett is worthy of our attention: "If the words which our Saviour used when he *gave thanks* or *blessed*, or consecrated the sacred elements, had been recorded by the Evangelists, and so made known to us, they would not have been proper to have been used by us. For to offer a thing to be done, and to offer the memorial of that which is already done; to offer oneself to suffer, and to offer the commemoration of another

[1] See Bishop Dowden in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, for July, 1900, Vol. I., p. 565. Cf. Lathbury's *History of the Nonjurors*, London, 1845, pp. 309–361. Cf. *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century, being the Correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops*, by the Rev. George Williams, London, 1868. For a brief account see *The Nonjurors, their Lives, Principles, and Writings*, by (the late) J. H. Overton, London, 1902, pp. 451–466.

[2] It should not be forgotten that Edward Stephens, who printed, in 1696, *The Liturgy of the Ancients represented, as near as well may be, in English Forms*, in which he used the Prayer of Consecration from the Scottish Book of 1637 (with a few verbal alterations), was the *first* to issue in *English* a Liturgy with the Narrative of Institution, the Oblation of the elements, and the Invocation in their *proper* order, thus anticipating the Liturgy of the Nonjurors by about a score of years. This second form, which was entitled *A Complete Form of Liturgy, or Divine Service, according to the Usage of the Most Ancient Christians*, and which was put forth c. 1700, is the earliest practical expression of that trend of thought which at length established in our American Church a really primitive and Catholic form of Eucharistic Prayer. If ever actually used, it must have been confined to the small congregation who gathered for a brief space around its compiler, yet it is deserving of interest as a milestone on the road to our present Prayer of Consecration. See Appendix, pp. 423–424.

person that has already suffered, can never be done with the same words, or exactly in the same manner; there must be what we call *mutatis mutandis* in such a case. We are indeed obliged to *give thanks*, to *bless* or consecrate, and offer as Christ did; but we cannot do it in the same words, if we knew what those words were, for the reasons here given.

"Again, in the last place, Christ instituted a new sacrament, and therefore it was proper for him to perform consecration in the first place, and then declare to his disciples the reason why he had done it, and what he required them to do: but we are to administer a sacrament already instituted, and therefore ought to declare our authority and commission for that ministration in the first place. So that although our Saviour first consecrated the elements before he spake the words, *Take eat, this my body*, etc., yet it is not proper for us to do so, because we use them not on the same occasion and to the same purpose he did: for he spake them at the very time he delivered the elements to his disciples, and in order to let them know what they then received at his hands; but we use them as declaration of the commission and authority by which we act in this ministration. . . . Now forasmuch as the holy Scriptures have not informed us how the Apostles did celebrate it, we can learn this only from tradition: and forasmuch as we have an universal uninterrupted tradition, that this sacrament was consecrated by pronouncing the words of institution, by making an oblation of the elements as the representative body and blood of Christ, with a thankful remembrance of his death, and by a petition for the divine benediction, or the Holy Spirit to descend upon the elements, and that this recital of the words of institution, the oblation and invocation, follow each other in this order in all Liturgies used before the Reformation, except the Roman only, we have as good evidence as we have for the canon of Scripture itself,

that this form and order was used and prescribed by the Apostles, and therefore that we ought not to deviate from it." [1]

Without quoting from Bishop Brett at greater length, we ought to remember that he was well acquainted with the whole literature of the subject, and that his treatise amply vindicates the Liturgy of the Nonjurors in its most vital part, the Anaphora. Moreover, he shows the utter absurdity of the later Roman position, and the insincerity of any appeal to the Council of Florence,[2] in the attempt to prove that the Greeks ever accepted Roman teaching in the matter of the consecration of the Eucharist.

After the most of the Nonjurors had returned to the communion of the Church of England, and the use of the Office of 1718 had been given up, Bishop Thomas Deacon (1697–1753) put forth a Liturgy [3] which follows very closely the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, almost verbatim in fact, in the part that corresponds to the Prayer of Consecration. This was in 1734, and in 1747 he published his two Catechisms,[4] from the shorter of which we will quote a brief extract. "The consecration of the Eucharist is thus performed: The Priest, after having placed the Bread and mixed Cup upon the altar, first gives God thanks for all his benefits and mercies conferred upon mankind, especially those of Creation and Redemption: he then recites how Jesus Christ instituted this Sacrament the night before his passion, and performs his command by doing what he did. He takes the Bread into his hands, and breaks it, which broken Bread represents the

[1] In his *Dissertation* appended to *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies*, etc. (first published in 1720), London, 1838, pp. 231–232, 233.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 236–246. [3] See Appendix, pp. 427–428

[4] *A Full, True, and Comprehensive View of Christianity*, etc. . . . *The Whole succinctly and fully laid down in Two Catechisms*, . . . London, 1747.

dead Body of Christ pierced upon the cross. He takes the Cup into his hands, which Cup, consisting of Wine and Water, represents the Blood and Water that flowed from the dead body of Christ upon the cross: he then repeats our Saviour's powerful words over them, by which the Bread and Cup are made authoritative representations or symbols of Christ's crucified Body and effused Blood: and being thus in a capacity to be offered to God, he accordingly makes the oblation, which is the highest and most proper act of Christian worship. After God has accepted of this Sacrifice, he is pleased to return it to us again to feast upon, that we may thereby partake of all the benefits of our Saviour's death and passion; in order to which, the Priest prays to God the Father to send his Holy Spirit upon the Bread and Cup offered to him, that he may enliven those representations of Christ's dead Body and effused Blood, and make them his spiritual life-giving Body and Blood in vertue and power, that the receivers thereof may obtain all the blessings of the institution." [1]

Bishop Thomas Rattray (1687–1743) prepared a critical edition of the Liturgy of S. James [2] which was published the year after his death. In an appendix he gave a translation of his "corrected" text of the Anaphora of S. James, with rubrics added and a form of offertory ceremonial prefixed.[3] While this Liturgy differed too much from those with which the Scottish clergy were familiar, for it to obtain general acceptance, it appears to have been used after Bishop Rattray's death at Craighall

[1] *A Full, True, and Comprehensive View of Christianity*, etc. . . . *The Whole succinctly and fully laid down in Two Catechisms*, . . . London, 1747, pp. 75–76. Cf. pp. 26–27; and (the Longer Catechism) pp. 131–132, 293–296, especially pp. 322–334.

[2] *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, etc., London, 1744. Cf. the Preface, pp. xii., xiii.; the foot-notes, pp. 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 42, 43; for his opinion as to Eucharistic consecration.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 111–122. See Appendix, pp. 428–430.

(Perthshire), if not elsewhere.[1] The influence of Bishop Rattray's Liturgy was very strong in determining the settlement of the Scottish Liturgy in 1764 on primitive lines so far as the consecration of the Eucharist was concerned. As his teaching upon the Eucharist coincides entirely with that of Bishop Deacon, it is not necessary to quote from his works.[2]

Bishop Archibald Campbell († 1744), in *An Essay upon the Holy Eucharist*,[3] says: "A true *Bishop* or *Priest*, rightly and duly *Ordained*, and who is neither *Heretick* nor *Schismatick* doth repeat the *Words* of *Institution*, over the *Offered Symbols* of *Bread* and *Wine*, mixed with *Water*, to shew that he hath *Authority* and a *Commission* from CHRIST to Execute this *Great*, *Tremendous*, *Mysterious* and most *Solemn Office* and *Administration*, and that in Obedience to the Command of CHRIST, who when He *Instituted* this His Last *Supper*, said τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, do as I have done St. *Luke* xxii. 19. . . . These *Sacred Symbols* are then offered up by Him who Officiates, to GOD the FATHER, that He may send His HOLY SPIRIT, to Operate in such manner upon this *Sacrifice*, that it may become unto the *Receivers* verily and indeed the most *Precious Energetical Spiritual Body* and *Blood* of CHRIST, for all the Purposes of the *Divine Institution*." [4] And again, "Under the *Gospel*, when the *Bishop* or *Priest* hath received the *Peoples* Offered *Materials* for the *Christian Sacrifice* and has made a *Priestly Oblation* of them, they are then prepared to be made a *Sacrifice*, and then the *Priest* pronounceth the *Words* of *Institution* over them, and imitateth the *Actions* of our *Blessed* LORD, by which the *Priests* Power to *Consecrate* by *Commission*, is shewed, and the *sacred Symbols* become

[1] See Bishop Dowden's *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, p. 92 and note 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 336–338.

[3] Appended to *The Doctrine of a Middle State* . . . London, 1721, pp. 285–319.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 306.

Consecrated, as far as in the Power of Man to do, by *Commission:* And then they are fit to be *Offered* up to GOD, by the *Priest*, in *Sacrifice* for all the *purposes* of the *Institution*, and they are accordingly *Offered* up in *Sacrifice* to GOD the FATHER, as *Commemorative* of, and in *Union* with the *One Great Sacrifice*, once *Offered*, by JESUS CHRIST of Himself upon the *Cross*. And this is the *proper Oblation* and *Sacrifice*, which may be called the *Third Oblation*, for the other two are neither of them a *Sacrifice*, but this Third *Oblation* is a *Sacrifice*, and in the *Primitive Liturgies*, is so called at this period of the Service and not before, and by the Concomitant *Sacrificial Prayer* the *Priest* begs of GOD the FATHER, that He would please to do, what none but He can do, to send down the HOLY GHOST upon the *Offered Sacrifice*, that the *sacred*, and now in part *Consecrated Symbols*, may, by His effectual *Operation*, became *Verily*, and *Indeed*, the Most Precious *Body* and *Blood* of CHRIST, to the Receivers. . . .

"And therefore although the *sacred Symbols* are duly *Sacrificed*, and that the *Act* is justly called a *Sacrifice*, and that the pronouncing the *Words* of *Institution* over them, and the imitating the *Actions* of CHRIST, at the *Institution* doth in so far *Consecrate* them, that they are then fit to be *Offered* up in *Sacrifice* to GOD, yet unless the HOLY GHOST descend upon them, which only GOD can do, and therefore ought to be prayed to do, it is but a Vain *Oblation* and *Sacrifice*, and of no *Energy* or *Advantage* to the *Receiver*, for it is, as without *Life*, until the presumed *Descent* of the HOLY GHOST upon it by whose effectual *Operation* only, it becomes *Verily*, and *Indeed*, the Most Precious *Body* and *Blood* of CHRIST to the Receivers." [1]

It would be most interesting to enlarge upon the citations already made, in order to illustrate the spirit of

[1] *An Essay upon the Holy Eucharist* appended to *The Doctrine of a Middle State* . . . London, 1721, pp. 307–308. Cf. also the Preface, pp. vii., ix.-x.; and p. 79.

earnest devotion to primitive truth in the persecuted Church in Scotland, that finally decided the form of the Scottish Liturgy in 1764. Bishop Dowden has done this so fully in his *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*,[1] that it is as unnecessary, as it would be impertinent, to attempt to go over the ground again. Let one quotation suffice from a Catechism[2] prepared by Bishop Robert Forbes, who, with Bishop W. Falconer, was chiefly instrumental in establishing the text of the Scottish Communion Office in the above-mentioned year.

"*Q.* By what power is this wonderful change made upon these weak Elements of Bread and Wine?

"*A.* 'Tis certain (as I have already said) from the Words of Institution, that Christ did make the Elements to be his Body and Blood, for he expressly tells us they are so: But no power inferiour to his own could make them so. As therefore the Holy Ghost is his Divine Substitute upon earth, by which he is present with his Church unto the end of the world, so whatever operations he now performs in his Church are wrought by that Divine Spirit. Therefore, that the Bread and Wine may become his Body and Blood, though not in *Substance*, yet in *Power*, *Virtue*, and *Effect*, it is necessary that this Holy Spirit should bless and sanctify them, and work in them and with them; because, as St John says (Chap. 6th, ver. 63rd), He is the Spirit that quickneth. Hence it is, that in the excellent Communion Office, authorized by King Charles the First, which we use, we have in the Prayer of Consecration a particular petition for the operation of the Holy Ghost, to make the Elements the Body and Blood of Christ." [3]

[1] *Q.v.*, pp. 1–107.

[2] *A Catechism dealing chiefly with the Holy Eucharist, by Robert Forbes, A.M. . . . Edited from the original MSS. for the Scottish Clergy Society*, by John Dowden, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, 1904.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 10–11. Cf. pp. 12–18.

It now remains for us briefly to relate the handing on to the American Church, of the Nonjuring tradition of adherence to early practice in the consecration of the Eucharist, through the mediation of Bishop Seabury (1729–1796). In going to Edinburgh in 1752 to study at the University, preparatory to receiving Holy Orders, the future Bishop was brought in contact with the persecuted Church in Scotland at the time when the Scottish Communion Office was being moulded into its present form, as the result of the honest researches of English and Nonjuring theologians since the Reformation.[1] When thirty years later he returned to Scotland and finally received episcopal consecration on the 14th of November, 1784, in the little chapel in Long-acre, Aberdeen, at the hands of Bishop Kilgour (Primus), Bishop Petrie, and Bishop J. Skinner, he was by no means a stranger to the Scottish usage in the consecration of the Eucharist. In his student days he had come into close touch with the Catholic remainder of the ancient Church of Scotland, and had known the depth of her feeling in respect of the Eucharistic service, for which she had endured every privation. There was therefore nothing hasty in his signing, on the day after his consecration, a Concordate with his Scottish consecrators, of which the fifth Article is as follows: —

"Art V. As the Celebration of the holy Eucharist, or the Administration of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, is the principal Bond of Union among Christians, as well as the most solemn Act of Worship in the Christian Church, the Bishops aforesaid agree in desiring that there may be as little Variance here as possible. And tho' the Scottish Bishops are very far from prescribing to their Brethren in this matter, they cannot help ardently wishing that Bishop Seabury would endea-

[1] *Life and Correspondence of the Right Reverend Samuel Seabury, D. D.*, . . . by E. Edwards Beardsley, D.D., LL.D., Boston, 1881, p. 7, note 2.

vour all he can, consistently with peace and prudence, to make the Celebration of this venerable Mystery conformable to the most primitive Doctrine and Practice in that respect: Which is the Pattern the Church of Scotland has copied after in her Communion Office, and which it has been the Wish of some of the most eminent Divines of the Church of England, that she also had more closely followed, than she seems to have done since she gave up her first reformed Liturgy, used in the Reign of King Edward VI., between which, and the form used in the Church of Scotland, there is no Difference in any point, which the primitive Church reckoned essential to the right Ministration of the holy Eucharist. In this capital Article therefore of the Eucharistic Service, in which the Scottish Bishops so earnestly wish for as much Unity as possible, Bishop Seabury also agrees to take a serious View of the Communion Office recommended by them, and if found agreeable to the genuine Standards of Antiquity, to give his Sanction to it, and by gentle Methods of Argument and Persuasion, to endeavour, as they have done, to introduce it by degrees into practice, without the Compulsion of Authority on the one side, or the prejudice of former Custom on the other." [1]

About six months after his return to America, Bishop Seabury received a letter congratulating him upon his consecration, from the Rev. William Smith,[2] at that time

[1] Beardsley, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

[2] Mr. Smith was a Scotsman, and possessed Scottish Orders. His first charge in America was Trinity Church, Oxford, together with All Saints, Pequestan (afterward Lower Dublin), both parishes then near (but now included within the limits of) the city of Philadelphia. He remained there from January 1, 1785, until his appointment to Stepney, Maryland, in the fall of the same year. On July 7, 1787, he became Rector of St. Paul's, Narragansett, R.I., and on January 28, 1790, Rector of Trinity Church, Newport R.I., and, as appears from Bishop Seabury's defence of him (see below, p. 234), was foremost in using the American Prayer of Consecration.

Rector of Stepney Parish, Maryland, from which a few quotations will now be made.

". . . Understanding that there were certain terms of Communion and a Concordate agreed upon and signed, by your Reverence and Consecrators, with so much the more freedom do I (tho' personally unknown yet I presume you may have heard some of these Bishops make mention of me) do I address you on a point of Episcopal practice among the Scotch Clergy, with regard to their manner of administering the Holy Eucharist. The Consecration Prayer, I allude to and the Form of Benediction with which the Elements are distributed. You know the Consecration prayer in the Scotch Communion Office is more full and complete, than the Parallel prayer in the English Communion Office, as it presently exists in its mutilated state; tho' the Consecration prayer of both was the same or very nearly so till Queen Elizabeth's time[1] that the lat[t]er cut off the Oblation and Invocation parts of said prayer, while the former retained them, and does so—and will do so, I may say to the end. This prayer I have used ever since I came to America — both at the Churches of All Saints and Oxford near Philadelphia, and since my appointment in Stepney parish in the State of Maryland, without hearing any one to find fault with it— At my settlement here I shewed the Vestry the Scotch Communion Office, and in particular the Consecration prayer, and wherein it exceeded the English Form, to the use of this prayer all were unanimous. — But Dr. Smith a few weeks ago wrote me, expressing his desire that I should conform to the English practice: — to the doctor I made a Return setting forth my reasons for using the

[1] This rather remarkable reference of the changes made in the Prayer of Consecration in the Book of 1549, to Qûeen Elizabeth's time is not easy of explanation, unless we suppose Mr. Smith to ignore the short-lived Book of 1552 (which lacked the approval of Convocation), and hence to date the mutilated Prayer of Consecration from its *re*-issue in 1559.

Scotch form, which was used in the English Church till Queen Elizabeth's time:[1] that as that prayer symbolized in all points with the primitive practice, of repeating 1st the words of our Blessed Lord's Institution, 2d the Oblation and 3d the Invocation — and the other does not, I could not so far depart from the Apostolic practice, as to adopt the use of a prayer which manifestly is abridged and mutilated. If it has not been mutilated, which we know it has, or if it has assertors who call it a perfect and complete prayer wanting nothing — may I not ask, how does it conclude in contradiction to St. Paul's Rule, of concluding all our Addresses to Heaven in and thro' Our Lord Jesus Christ? . . . As to the Repeating solely the Words of the Holy Institution of the Blessed Eucharist — as consecratory of the Elements, without any concomitant prayer; the whole Tide of primitive practice is different — for all the Churches used the Oblation and Invocation; and the Roman was the first Church that placed the whole of the Consecration in repeating the words of Institution. . . .

"Had I been able to have attended the Convention of this State at Baltimore it is likely my practice would have been called in question. . . . I am ready to stand for the Truth and Primitive practice, and stand in awe of handling the word of God deceitfully. If my Brethren here chose to condemn me for adhering to the faith delivered to the Saints, I shall find no fault with *their* adherence to what they judge best, tho' I own I could wish that in these days of enquiry they would enquire whether these things are so or not. I should esteem it a favour, to be informed by your Reverence, how this Affair stands betwixt you and your Consecrators — and as I well know the point of view, the Scotch Bishops see the English Consecration prayer in, I am very much led to think that perhaps it may be One of the Terms of the Concordate, that Your Reverence and those You ordain shall use the Scotch

[1] See note on opposite page.

Communion Office, if not all of it, at least the Consecration prayer.[1] I hope your Reverence will not deem me over-zealous for this prayer and Office, — and the practice of Antiquity — the practice too of that Church whose Ordination I bear — not only so, but whose Consecration the first Bishop in America bears. . . ."

This letter[2] was written from Eden Academy, Somerset County, Maryland, Nov. 5, 1785, and is endorsed in Bishop Seabury's handwriting as having been received December 8, and answered December 12, 1785. Bishop Seabury's answer is not known to be in existence at present, but it is evident from his subsequent course of action, that this letter of Mr. Smith's must have been a source of encouragement to him in his endeavours to put into operation the terms of the Concordate with his Scottish consecrators. For Mr. Smith's letter is evidence not only of his own warm personal adherence to the Scottish form of Consecration, but also of a somewhat extended appreciation of its superiority to the English form, upon the part of the laity in Pennsylvania and Maryland. Moreover, it would seem that the defence which he made in his "Return setting forth" his "reasons for using the Scotch form," in reply to Dr. Smith's remonstrance, was not without its effect upon the latter; if we may judge from Dr. Smith's letters to Dr. White and to Mr. Parker in report-

[1] That Mr. Smith's own practice became in due time the rule for the American Church, is one of the most interesting facts of history. Although Bishop Seabury, in his own Communion Office, followed the order and arrangement of the Scottish Office of 1764, it was the English Communion Office with the replacement of its Prayer of Consecration by the Scottish form that became the distinctive American rite.

[2] The extracts from this letter given in the text are reproduced *verbatim* from the original MS. in the possession of the Rev. W. J. Seabury, D.D. (great-grandson of Bishop Seabury), through whose kindness and assistance the transcription was made and compared. Contractions have been expanded, but no alteration has been made.

ing the amendment to the English Prayer of Consecration proposed by the Maryland Convention of 1786,[1] and from the fact that in the General Convention of 1789, Dr. Smith, then President of the House of Deputies, so heartily and effectively championed[2] the adoption of the present American Prayer of Consecration. It is at least noteworthy, that so early as the beginning of 1785, the chief "alteration and amendment" made in the English Book of Common Prayer in 1789 was anticipated by Mr. Smith's habitual substitution of the Scottish Prayer of Consecration for the meagre English form, leaving the order and arrangement of the English Communion Office intact.

We are not surprised, then, that Bishop Seabury in his Second Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, delivered at Derby, Connecticut, on the 22d of September, 1786, says in speaking of the Holy Communion: "They [the primitive Christians] called and esteemed it to be the Christian Sacrifice, commemorative of the great sacrifice of atonement which Christ had made for the sins of the whole world; wherein, under the symbols of bread and the cup, the body and blood of Christ which he offered up, and which were broken and shed upon the cross, are figured forth; and being presented to God our heavenly Father, by his Priest here on earth, the merits of Christ for the remission of sins are pleaded by him, and we trust by our great High Priest himself in heaven: And being sanctified by prayer, thanksgiving, the words of institution, and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, are divided among the Communicants as a Feast upon the Sacrifice." [3] At this same time he set forth for use in his own Diocese a Communion Office which is the Scottish Office of 1764 with but a few verbal alterations, and these of

[1] See below, pp. 235–237, and Appendix, pp. 434–435.

[2] See below, p. 229 and note 3.

[3] Beardsley, *op. cit.*, pp. 280–281. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 274–276.

but minor importance.[1] The clergy of Connecticut, became very strongly attached to this Communion Office, and it was used even after the adoption of the American Prayer Book, at least in some places, as late as 1819.[2] Consistently with his belief, with the Concordate, and with the Office he had put forth in accordance therewith, we find Bishop Seabury writing to Bishop White, under date of the 29th June, 1789, as follows: "That the most exceptionable part of the English book is the Communion Office may be proved by a number of very respectable names among her clergy. The grand fault in that office is the deficiency of a more formal oblation of the elements, and of the invocation of the Holy Ghost to sanctify and bless them. The Consecration is made to consist merely in the Priest's laying his hands on the elements and pronouncing '*This is my body*,' etc., which words are not consecration at all, nor were they addressed by Christ to the Father, but were declarative to the Apostles. This is so exactly symbolizing with the Church of Rome in an error; an error, too, on which the absurdity of Transubstantiation is built, that nothing but having fallen into the same error themselves could have prevented the enemies of the Church from casting it in her teeth. The efficacy of Baptism, of Confirmation, of Orders, is ascribed to the Holy Ghost, and His energy is implored for that purpose; and why he should not be invoked in the consecration of the Eucharist, especially as all the old Liturgies are full to the point, I cannot conceive. It is much easier to account for the alterations of the first Liturgy of Edward VI., than to justify them; and as I have been told there is a vote on the minutes of your Convention, anno 1786, I

[1] See Professor Hart's edition of *Bishop Seabury's Communion Office* (second edition, revised), New York, 1883, pp. 36–38; and Bishop Dowden's *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, pp. 290–292.

[2] Beardsley, *op. cit.*, pp. 263–264, and note 1. Cf. Professor Hart's edition of *Bishop Seabury's Communion Office*, already cited, p. 52.

believe, for the revision of this matter, I hope it will be taken up, and that God will raise up some able and worthy advocate for this primitive practice, and make you and the Convention the instruments of restoring it to His Church in America. It would do you more honour in the world and contribute more to the union of the Churches than any other alterations you can make, and would restore the Holy Eucharist to its ancient dignity and efficacy." [1] This letter was laid before the General Convention of 1789 on the 30th of July.[2] The Convention adjourned from the 8th of August until the 29th of September, and during this last session, on the 14th of October, the present American Prayer of Consecration was adopted, owing primarily to the strong influence of Bishop Seabury. Of this change Bishop White speaks thus: "In the service for the administration of the communion, it may perhaps be expected, that the great change made, in restoring to the consecration prayer the oblatory words and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, left out in King Edward's reign, must at least have produced an opposition. But no such thing happened to any considerable extent, or at least the author did not hear of any in the other house, further than a disposition to the effect in a few gentlemen, which was counteracted by some pertinent remarks of the president.[3] In that of the Bishops, it lay

[1] *Journals of General Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States*, 1785–1835. Edited by William Stevens Perry, D.D., three vols., Claremont, N.H., 1874; Vol. III., *Historical Notes and Documents*, pp. 387–388.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. I., p. 71.

[3] The Rev. William Smith, D.D. Cf. the following account from his biography: —

"Bishops Seabury and White constituted the House of Bishops when our present Communion Office was about to be proposed to The House of Deputies for their adoption. The two Bishops preferred the *Scotch* Communion Service to the English, and after they had sent *it* to the House of Deputies felt anxious and timid

very near to the heart of Bishop Seabury. . . . Bishop Seabury's attachment to these changes may be learned from the following incident. On the morning of the Sunday which occurred during the session of the convention, the author wished him to consecrate the elements. This he declined. On the offer being again made at the time when the service was to begin, he still declined, and, smiling, added — To confess the truth, I hardly consider the form to be used, as strictly amounting to a consecration. The form was of course that used heretofore; the changes not having taken effect." [1]

By this act, Bishop Seabury strikingly manifested his conviction of the great superiority of the Scottish and

about the result. . . . The Bishops sent for Dr. Smith, then President of the House of Deputies, for a private conference. They frankly admitted that they had gone to the Scotch Communion Office for a material portion of their labors. But as Dr. Smith was a born Scotchman, this was a compliment to his country, which subdued his prejudices, if he had any. He agreed to introduce the new office to the House of Deputies and recommend it for adoption. The next day he informed the House of the document intrusted to him, and of its variations from the better known office of the Church of England. A storm began to brew, and hoarse whispers about popery reached his ears. He rose in his place, and, exclaiming, 'Hear — [pronouncing it *Heyre*] — before ye judge,' began to read. Dr. Smith was a superb reader and withal had just enough of a Scotch brogue to make his tones more musical and his emphasis more thrilling. He soon caught attention, and read his paper through without a single interruption, his hearers becoming more and more absorbed and charmed. When he had finished, the new office was accepted with acclamations. Wherefore, if there is anything in our Communion Office which Churchmen of the present day delight in, not to say glory in, they should hold the memory of Dr. William Smith in cherished admiration." *Life and Correspondence of the Rev. William Smith, D.D.*, by his great-grandson, Horace Wemyss Smith, two vols., Philadelphia, 1880, Vol. II., pp. 290–291.

[1] *Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America . . . by the Right Reverend William White, D.D.*, edited with notes . . . by the Rev. B. F. DeCosta, New York, 1880, pp. 178–180.

American form over the English. At the same time he did not deny the validity of the English form, for though refusing to consecrate by it, he did not hesitate to receive the elements as consecrated by it.[1]

Bishop Seabury had thus accomplished the desire of his heart and had knitted all the closer the willing bands of the Concordate he had signed the day after his consecration to the Episcopate. In the Liturgy of the infant Church of America he had succeeded in planting an Apostolic and Catholic Prayer of Consecration, differing in but a single phrase from that of his own Communion Office and of the Mother Church of Scotland. This slight change did not affect the rationale of the Prayer, it was but the substitution of a periphrastic expression for one more direct (with a view of avoiding an apparent savour of transubstantiation), in the concluding part of *The Invocation.*[2] The Scottish and American forms begin alike: "And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine;" — and then while the Scottish form expresses the purpose of this high blessing asked upon the simple elements of bread and wine, thus: "that they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son," — the American form phrases the purpose in this manner: "that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood." No higher dignity (or consecration) could be impetrated of God for the bread and wine than that, as the result of their being blessed and sanctified by God's Word and Holy Spirit, the reception of the elements thus consecrated should be

[1] Cf. an original letter of the Rev. William Jones Seabury, D.D., to the Rev. W. F. Brand, D.D., quoted in the Appendix, pp. 430–434.

[2] See below, pp. 236–237.

equated with the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ. It would have been an easy matter, merely to have taken the form suggested by the Maryland and the Pennsylvania Conventions of 1786,[1] *i.e.* to insert a phrase of blessing into the weak English Invocation and to leave the rest untouched, including the English rubric for a second consecration. This at best would have been but a sorry compromise, better than no improvement at all in that most unsatisfactory of Eucharistic Prayers, yet far removed from the glory of the Scottish form, and from the unity of the Spirit in the undivided Church. The General Convention of 1789 made an "alteration and amendment" of supreme importance, and in the direction of the restoration of the impaired unity of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, by adopting the Scottish[2] in preference

[1] See below, pp. 235–238, and Appendix, pp. 434–436. Cf. Table III., 6, p. 15.

[2] The following words may well be quoted here as furnishing an instance of the fact that *The Invocation* in our American Prayer of Consecration was traditionally regarded, in the middle of the last century, in Scotland, as equivalent to the Scottish form.

"It seems to afford no inconsiderable testimony to the purity and soundness of the Eucharistic Office of our Church, that so recently as the year 1785 [a misprint for 1789], and with all the light which learning has shed on this subject, and with the tendency philosophy has to introduce latitudinarian views in every matter in religion which savours of the mysterious, the Prayer of Consecration in our Office has been adopted by the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. It has been faithfully copied in its three portions, — first, there is the recitation of the words of Institution, then the Oblation, and then follows the Invocation in these words: — 'And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and of thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Word and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine;' and then, instead of what follows in the Scottish Office — 'that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son,' it is changed into — 'that we receiving them, according to thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood.' Here the

to the English form of Eucharistic consecration; and then safeguarded this change by adopting along with it the Scottish rubric for a second consecration [1] (with the slight verbal difference required by the variation of the concluding clause of *The Invocation*), thus making assurance doubly sure that the Scottish heritage in our Prayer of Consecration be impossible of alienation. Moreover that the passing of a hundred years had not dimmed the Church's appreciation of this heritage is seen in the rubric inserted in 1892 directing as an irreducible minimum in consecrating the sacrament for the Communion of the Sick, the same "form" [2] as that prescribed in the rubric for the consecration of more elements if those previously consecrated do not suffice. The slight change made in *The Invocation* in 1789 was entirely satisfactory to any theologian in touch with the doctrinal and liturgical

doctrine is still the same as is indicated in our Office. It is the Holy Spirit which sanctifies the bread and wine, and He is solemnly invoked to perform this spiritual operation upon them, which enables those who receive with due preparation of heart and life, to be partakers of the Body and Blood of our Lord; equivalent, as it must appear, to what we mean when we pray the Almighty to sanctify with the Holy Spirit these elements, that they may become the Body and Blood, so that whoever rightfully receives is a partaker of his most blessed Body and Blood. The one looks onward to the final result, while the other rests on the step which leads to it; for they must be in some sense the Body and Blood, before we can, by receiving them, be said to be partakers of these. Such, then, is the Consecration Prayer in the American Liturgy; and it affords a fuller assent to the value of ours, that in all other parts of the Office the form of the English Ritual has been adopted, and here only the preference has been given to ours, as more distinctly conveying the true character of the Rite according to the teaching of the Apostles, evinced by the Formularies introduced by them into the churches they planted."

Address to the Members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. By a Layman. London: J. Lendrum, 7, Warwick Square; Edinburgh: R. Grant and Son; Aberdeen: W. Spark, 1846, pp. 46–47.

[1] See Table IV., 6, p. 17.

[2] American Standard Book of Common Prayer (1892), p. 293.

traditions and standards of the Nonjurors. To Bishop Seabury there could be no essential difference between the form of *The Invocation* in the Scottish Prayer of Consecration and that adopted in Philadelphia, October 14, 1789; one would be equally as acceptable to him as the other. We find him writing under date of February 24, 1790, "With regard to the prayer which Mr. Smith uses at the Consecration of the Eucharist, I use the same myself, and after October next it will be used throughout the United States. Nor can I see why the warmest friend of the Church of England should object to it. I have no wish to depreciate the Church of England. She has, I believe, few faults — but the prayer of Consecration in her Communion office is deficient, even in the opinion of her ablest vindicators. I shall mention but one deficiency in her Consecration prayer, viz. that it is not put up to the Almighty Father through the Mediation of Jesus Christ. I could mention more,[1] but I had rather conceal than expose even the appearance of a blemish in a Church which I love and honor, and of which I profess myself a member. The prayer Mr. Smith[2] uses is nearly the same with that in Edward VI.'s Prayer Book, composed by Cranmer, Ridley, etc., which was altered to its present form to please the Presbyterians of Geneva, Germany, and England, who gave encouragement that they would come into the Church on that ground: but were not as good as their word. I do not speak by guess when I say that a great number of the Clergy and Laity in England would rejoice to have the same prayer, which you complain of, in the English book; and whenever it shall please God that they shall have another reform of the Prayer Book, it will most certainly take place."

[1] Cf. Bishop Seabury's letter to Bishop White, pp. 228–229.

[2] See above, p. 223, and note 2. It is not likely that Mr. Smith would have adopted the use of the American Prayer of Consecration, *before* its use became compulsory, if he had not believed it to be equivalent to the Scottish form.

Bishop Seabury could not have written in this manner if he had not considered the Prayer of Consecration in the American Book which was to go into general use October 1, 1790, the equivalent of that which he had set forth for his diocese in 1786, after the Scottish and primitive model. Let any sober-minded person read this letter side by side with the letter Bishop Seabury wrote to Bishop White June 29, 1789,[1] and they will see that Bishop Seabury thoroughly realized that his dearest wishes had been fulfilled, and that thus the American Church had been brought into line with the early and undivided Church of Christ at the heart of her Eucharistic worship.

That Bishop Seabury was so successful in his efforts was owing in large measure to the support given to this improvement by Dr. William Smith, president of the House of Deputies.[2] We should also remember that there had already been a movement in this direction upon the part of two Diocesan (or State) Conventions in 1786. Thus in the Maryland Convention held at Annapolis, April 4, 1786, among the amendments to the "Proposed Book" was one modifying the Prayer of Consecration as it stood in that, and in the English Book of Common Prayer. Dr. Smith, under date of April 9, writes to Dr. (afterward Bishop) White as follows: "A few alterations are proposed to be offered to the next *Convention*. . . . An addition to the *Consecration Prayer* at the holy Sacrament, for a Blessing on the Elements, w'ch being only a few Words, and those extremely proper, and agreeable to the Practice of all other Protestant Churches, as well as what was in the 1st Liturgy of Edw'd VI. hath perfectly reconciled Mr Smith[3] to our Service

[1] See above, pp. 228–229.

[2] See Bishop White's *Memoirs*, cited above, pp. 229–230. Cf. *The Life of Dr. William Smith*, Vol. II., pp. 290–291, cited above, p. 229, note 3.

[3] See above, pp. 223–226.

and will prevent any further Division between us and the numbers of Clergy coming among us from Bp. S. and the Scots Church.

"In the Scots and Edw'd 1st's[1] Liturgy the Prayer was exceptionable and leaning much to *Transubstantiation* in these words — 'Vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, that they *may* BE unto us the *Body* and *Blood*,' etc. The Scots still stronger, viz. 'that they may BECOME unto us the *Body* and *Blood*.' . . . The Alteration as we propose it is thus, beginning at the words in the Consecration Prayer, 'Hear us O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and vouchsafe so to *bless* and *sanctify* these thy Creatures of Bread and Wine that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour J. C. holy Institution, in Remembrance,' etc. as it now stands. This reads as well as before, pleases all sides, and is certainly an Improvement, as there was before no Invocation of a Blessing on the sacred Elements. When you send the Book to Mr Parker of Boston, before their ensuing Convention, send him as from me, with the Compl'ts of the Maryland Convention, the foregoing proposed addition in the Consecration Prayer."[2]

[1] Evidently intended for "Edw'd's 1st."

[2] *Journals of General Conventions. . . .* Edited by W. S. Perry, D.D., Vol. III., *Historical Notes and Documents*, pp. 190–191. It is interesting to compare with this proposed modification of the English Prayer of Consecration, a proposal made (c. 1717) by those Nonjurors who desired the restoration of the Invocation, to those of them who did not wish to depart at all from the English rite. As a minimum in this particular, the "Usagers" were willing to rest content with this slight modification: "That the Petition in the Prayer of Consecration be always; *Hear us, O Merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee;* **Bless** *these thy Creatures of Bread and Wine; and grant that we, etc.*" See Brett, *Dissertation* pp. 404–407 (edition of 1838). Cf. *A Vindication of the Reasons and Defence, etc.* Part II., pp. 90–91; 127. London, 1719. (This last was written by Bishop Jeremy Collier.)

Writing not many days later, April 17, to the Rev. Mr. Parker of Boston, Dr. Smith repeats what he had written to Dr. White, almost word for word, closing his notice of the subject thus:—

"The Maryland Convention have proposed also an Addition in the Consecration Prayer in the holy Communion, something analogous to that of the Liturgy of Edward 6th and the Scots Liturgy, *invoking* a blessing on the Elements of Bread and Wine, which was left out at the first Review of the English Liturgy, it is said, at the instance of *Bucer*, and otherwise because the Invocation favoured the Doctrine of *Transubstant[iat]ion* and it does now in the Scots Liturgy praying to bless and sanctify the Elements that they may *become the Body and Blood*, etc. We have proposed to retain the Prayer and yet avoid the exceptionable part, and it will run thus —

"'Hear us O Merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and with thy Word and holy Spirit vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify these Thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, that we receiving the same, according to Thy Son our Saviour J. C. holy Institution, etc.'

"This I think will be a proper Amendment, and it perfectly satisfies such of our Clergy and People as were attach'd to the Scots and other ancient Liturgies, all of which have an Invocation of a Blessing on the Elements as is indeed most reasonable and proper.

"I am anxious to write you by this Post to have a Chance of your receiving this before the Meeting of your Convention."[1]

The Pennsylvania Convention which met on the 22d of May that same year (1786) adopted the same amendment

[1] *Journals of Genl. Conv. . . .* Vol. III., pp. 199–200. It is to be noted that in this letter Dr. Smith adds the words, "with thy Word and holy Spirit." This is evidently a slip (though a prophetic one) upon his part, as may be seen by comparison with his letter to Dr. White, just quoted, and with the actual resolutions of the Convention. See Appendix, pp. 434–435.

to the Prayer of Consecration that the Maryland Convention had adopted the preceding month.[1] It would seem likely that this action was taken at the suggestion of Dr. White, as in writing to Dr. Smith on the 12th of April he had said in reference to the alterations decided upon in the Maryland Convention, "I think ye proposed Alterations of your Convention will render our Service more compleat."[2] It was this action of the Pennsylvania Convention to which Bishop Seabury appealed in his letter quoted above,[3] and which opened the way for the still better amendment proposed by him and adopted in the General Convention of 1789. We are thus absolutely sure of the *raison d'être* of the most noteworthy of the "alterations and amendments" made to the English Book of Common Prayer. The action effecting this improvement was taken by intelligent men, with their eyes wide open, with the deliberate intention of conforming the worship of the Church in America to the primitive standard in the consecration of the Eucharist, that is to say, in order to obviate the mistaken notion of consecration by the mere recital of Christ's words of Declaration and Institution, and instead, to impetrate in *The Invocation* for the Divine blessing upon the elements before bidding the communicant receive them as the Body and Blood of Christ.

In Bishop Seabury's sermon "Of the Holy Eucharist,"[4] we have not only plain evidence of his own acceptance of the Scottish, Nonjuring tradition, but also the theological background of the Prayer of Consecration placed in the American Book of Common Prayer on the 14th of October, 1789. His words are surely worth our attention, not

[1] See Appendix, p. 436. Cf. Bishop Cosin's suggested form of the Invocation. See above, pp. 189–190.

[2] *Journals of Genl. Conv.*, Vol. III., *Historical Notes*, etc., p. 191.

[3] See above, pp. 228–229.

[4] *Discourses on Several Subjects*, by Samuel Seabury, D.D. (in two vols.), Hudson, 1815, Vol. I., pp. 144–162. (Reprinted from the edition of 1793, New York, T. and J. Swords.)

only as those of a master in theology, but also as the utterance of one to whom, under God, the American Church owes so great a debt of gratitude. One quotation must suffice:—

"By attending to these [the early liturgies], we shall not only see the order and process of the consecration of the holy elements, but also the principles on which their practice was founded.

"At the time of the celebration, the officiating bishop, or priest, first gave thanks to God for all his mercies, especially for those of creation and redemption. Then, to show the authority by which he acts, and his obedience to the command of Christ, he recites the institution of the holy sacrament which he is celebrating, as the holy evangelists have recorded it. In doing this, he takes the bread into his hands and breaks it, to represent the dead body of Christ, torn and pierced on the cross; the cup, also, of wine and water mixed, representing the blood and water which flowed from the dead body of Christ, when wounded by the soldier's spear. Over the bread and the cup he repeats Christ's powerful words, THIS IS MY BODY — THIS IS MY BLOOD. The elements being thus made authoritative representations, or symbols of Christ's crucified body and blood, are in a proper capacity to be offered to God as the great and acceptable sacrifice of the christian church. Accordingly, the oblation, which is the highest, most solemn, and proper act of Christian worship, is then immediately made. Continuing his prayer, the priest intercedes with the Almighty Father, to send upon them (the bread and wine) the Holy Spirit, to sanctify and bless them, and make the *bread* the *body*, and the *cup* the *blood* of Christ — his spiritual life-giving body and blood in power and virtue; that to all the faithful, they may be effectual to all spiritual purposes. . . . The Eucharist being as its name imports, a sacrifice of thanksgiving, the bread and wine, after they have been offered or given

to God, and blessed and sanctified by his Holy Spirit, are returned by the hand of his minister to be eaten by the faithful, as a *feast upon the sacrifice*. . . . We communicate with God through Christ the Mediator, by first offering, or giving to him the sacred symbols of the body and blood of his dear Son, and then receiving them again, blessed and sanctified by his Holy Spirit, to feast upon at his table, for the refreshment of our souls." [1]

There is also interesting evidence of the fact that the true rationale of the Prayer of Consecration in the American Communion Office was well understood and accepted in the early years of the nineteenth century. In an edition of the Book of Common Prayer, published by Plowman and Tanner, at Philadelphia, in 1805, we find prefixed *An Introduction, containing Observations on the Services for Morning and Evening, Sundays and Holydays*.[2] From the comment on "*The Prayer of Consecration*" we may well quote as follows: "As our Saviour himself did not deliver the bread and wine until he had consecrated them, by *blessing them*, and *giving thanks*, so the Priest is expected to pour out his Prayers over this mysterious food of our souls. Such a Prayer is the most ancient and essential part of the whole Communion Office. There are some, who believe that the part of the present Form, *Who, in the same night*, etc., was used by the Apostles; and it is certain. no Liturgy in the world has altered that particular.

"There was inserted in the primitive Forms, a particular Petition, for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Sacramental Elements: this was in the Service of the Church of England, when Popish, and was continued in the first Liturgy of Edward VI. but was left out of the second,

[1] Seabury, *Discourses*, Vol. I., pp. 159–160.

[2] This comment is substantially taken from Wheatly. Cf. above, pp. 203–206. This *Introduction* was reprinted separately in 1809 by Abel Dickinson, Whitehall, Philadelphia.

and the following sentence placed in its stead, 'Hear us, O merciful father,' etc., etc. But in the American Liturgy, the invocation is restored.

"In the Book of Common Prayer, as used by the Church of England, it looks, as if the Rubric, after the form of Administration, was meant to imply, that the Consecration of the Elements is made by the words of Institution merely. But though all Churches in the world, as has just been said, have in the Consecration, used the words of Institution, yet none before the Church of Rome, ever attributed the Consecration to the bare pronouncing of those words; that was always attributed to the efficacy of the Prayer of the Church. It should be considered that our Saviour may have used other words; for the Evangelists tell us, that he *gave thanks, and blessed* the Bread and Wine, which must be performed in some words, that are addressed to God, and not in those addressed to men, as the words of Institution were. It would seem therefore, that the words spoken by our Saviour to his Disciples, could not be the whole Consecration of the Elements, but rather a declaration of the effect which was produced by the Consecration. And accordingly in the American Book the Rubrick abovementioned has been so altered as to require, that the Minister at the Consecration of fresh Elements should repeat, not merely the words of Institution, but the whole of the Form of Consecration, from these words: *All glory be to Thee*, etc., to the words, *Partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood*, inclusive. . . . The American Church has restored the Prayer of Oblation to its ancient place; and has made it expressly refer as formerly to the Bread and Wine." [1]

We have now reached the terminus of our investigation of the rationale of the chief "alteration and amendment" introduced into the Book of Common Prayer by the American revisers of 1789. We have examined the Prayer

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 56–57.

of Consecration (and the accompanying rubric for a second consecration of elements, if those already consecrated are not sufficient for the communicants present), in point of the phraseology and of the grammatical construction of its parts, and have marked the patent rationale of Eucharistic consecration therein contained and set forth. We have inquired into the sequence of our Lord Christ's own acts and utterances upon the occasion of the original Institution. So doing, we observed that His act of consecration is uniformly described by the New Testament writers as an act of "thanksgiving-blessing," whereby He set apart and hallowed the elements of bread and wine to be the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Other hints afforded by the New Testament writings confirm this, and suggest the order, or plan, appropriate for the Church to use in her observance of the Christian "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." By reason of Christ's word of command, through the means of prayer, has the Church consecrated her Eucharist from the very beginning. Obedient to her Master's bidding, "Do this for My memorial," the Church has ever offered up high praise and hearty thanks to God for all the blessings vouchsafed in creation and redemption, and for the Institution of the Eucharistic memorial of His unique sacrifice, repeating the Narrative of that Institution as the Warrant for her observance of the Christian sacrifice. Then solemn and humble prayer has she ever made to the Father of all, for His acceptance of the memorial gifts of bread and wine presented before His Divine Majesty, and for the hallowing of them by the Holy Spirit to be the communion of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood. The witness of the early Christian writers, the witness of the great army of the Fathers, the witness of the Liturgies actually used in the ancient and undivided Church, agree in one. Unto this day, moreover, we have found that the Churches of the East (heterodox as well as orthodox) preserve un-

broken this primitive tradition of Eucharistic consecration. Rome and the Churches that paid obedience to her, alone wandered from the unity of Christendom in this particular. After the schism of East and West, forgetting the older tradition, growing ignorant of the Fathers, under the guidance of a materialized notion of the Eucharistic Presence, Rome slowly evolved a new and unprimitive theory of consecration, which dominated the thought of the West until the Reformation. The gradual sloughing off of this error, and the recovery of the truly Catholic rationale of Eucharistic consecration, within the Anglican Communion, we have traced briefly; from the first symptom of better things in the First Book of King Edward VI., through the pages of some fairly representative English theologians (not forgetting the noble and learned Nonjurors), to the full and accurate reëstablishment of the ancient Catholic tradition by the persecuted Scottish Church in 1764, and by the American Church in 1789.

We may, therefore, thus sum up our study of the Prayer of Consecration in the American Liturgy. It has a natural and obvious rationale and significance; it follows strictly the analogy of Christ's own Institution, in obedience to His command, "Do this"; it is in absolute accord with early patristic teaching, both Eastern and Western; it is in perfect harmony with the norm of the primitive liturgical tradition, with the unaltered usage of the Eastern Church until to-day, and of the Western Church until after the eleventh century; and it stands before us as the finished work of the English Reformation, in the matter of the consecration of the Eucharist. It is an inheritance of which we may be justly proud, and it will some day prove a most important factor in promoting the reunion of Christendom.

APPENDIX

CONTAINING THE ORIGINAL LATIN AND GREEK TEXTS, AND OTHER ORIGINAL MATTER, REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS

APPENDIX

Justin Martyr. 110–165 A.D.

I Apol. Ch. 65–67

65. . . . Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται· οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων· "Ἀμήν." τὸ δὲ ἀμὴν τῇ Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ τὸ γένοιτο σημαίνει. Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

66. Καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία . . . οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· "τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου, τουτέστι τὸ σῶμά μου. Καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· τοῦτό ἐστιν αἷμά μου," καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι . . .

67. . . . Καὶ, ὡς προέφημεν, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ ἀμήν· καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται. P. G. vi., 428, 429.

Irenæus. 120–202 A.D.

Adv. Haereses, Bk. V., ch. ii., 3

Ὅπότε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ . . . Καὶ ὅνπερ τρόπον τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου κλιθὲν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῷ ἰδίῳ· καιρῷ ἐκαρποφόρησε, καὶ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ διαλυθείς, πολλοστὸς ἐγέρθη διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ συνέχοντος τὰ πάντα· ἔπειτα δὲ διὰ τῆς σοφίας τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς χρῆσιν ἐλθόντα ἀνθρώπων, καὶ προσλαμβανόμενα τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐχαριστία γίνεται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. P. G. vii., 1125, 1127.

Ibid. Bk. IV., ch. xviii., 5

Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν[1] τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκεῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου. P. G. vii., 1028, 1029.

Ibid. Bk. I., ch. xiii., 2

Ποτήρια οἴνῳ κεκραμένα προσποιούμενος εὐχαριστεῖν, καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐκτείνων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως, πορφυρέα καὶ ἐρυθρὰ ἀναφαίνεσθαι ποιεῖ· ὡς δοκεῖν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅλα Χάριν τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἑαυτῆς στάζειν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ποτηρίῳ διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως αὐτοῦ. P. G. vii., 580.

[1] Ἐπίκλησιν for ἔκκλησιν. See Holl, *Fragmente Vornicän. Kirchenväter*, p. 61. *Texte u. Unters.*, N. F., V. 2.

Fragment xxxvi., ed. Harvey, Vol. II., 500–505

. . . Προσφέρομεν γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ ὅτι τῇ γῇ ἐκέλευσεν ἐκφῦσαι τοὺς καρποὺς τούτους εἰς τροφὴν ἡμετέραν, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν προσφορὰν τελέσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων, τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν.

Irenaeus to Victor. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v., 24

. . . Καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων, ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς· καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ, κατ' ἐντροπὴν δηλονότι, καὶ μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἀπηλλάγησαν . . . P. G. vii., 1232.

Clement of Alexandria. fl. c. 202 A.D.

Stromata, Bk. I., ch. xix.

Εἰσὶ γὰρ οἱ καὶ ὕδωρ ψιλὸν εὐχαριστοῦσιν.

P. G. viii., 813.

Origen. 185–252 A.D.

On St. Matt. xv., 11

Εἰ δὲ πᾶν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα εἰς κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται, καὶ τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως, κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγενομένην αὐτῷ εὐχήν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ὠφέλιμον γίνεται, καὶ τῆς τοῦ νοῦ αἴτιον διαβλέψεως ὁρῶντος ἐπὶ τὸ ὠφελοῦν· καὶ οὐχ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὸν μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν. P. G. xiii., 949.

Contra Celsum, viii., 33

Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῷ τοῦ παντὸς Δημιουργῷ εὐχαριστοῦντες, καὶ τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προ-

σαγομένους ἄρτους ἐσθίομεν, σῶμα γενομένους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἅγιόν τι καὶ ἁγιάζον τοὺς μετὰ ὑγιοῦς προθέσεως αὐτῷ χρωμένους. P. G. xi., 1565.

Tertullian. 145–220 A.D.

Adv. Marcion., Bk. IV., ch. xl.

Professus itaque [Christus] se concupiscentia concupisse edere pascha ut suum (indignum enim, ut quid alienum concupisceret Deus) acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum fecit, "Hoc est corpus meum" dicendo, id est figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus. P. L. ii., 491.

Firmilian to Cyprian. 256 A.D.

Atqui illa mulier . . . etiam hoc frequenter ausa est, ut et invocatione non contemptibile sanctificare se panem et eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino non sine sacramento solitae praedicationis offeret.

P. L. iii., 1213.

Cyprian. 200–258 A.D.

Epistle (to Epictetus, etc.), lxiv., 4

Nec oblatio sanctificari illic possit ubi Spiritus Sanctus non sit, nec cuiquam Dominus per ejus orationes et preces prosit qui Dominum ipse violavit.

P. L. iv., 404.

De Oratione Dominica, ch. xxxi.

Sacerdos, ante orationem praefatione praemissa parat fratrum mentes dicendo: "Sursum corda." P. L. iv., 537.

De unitate Ecclesiae Catholicae, ch. xvii.

Hostis altaris, adversus sacrificium Christi rebellis, pro fide perfidus, pro religione sacrilegus, inobsequens servus, filius impius, frater inimicus, contemptis episcopis et Dei sacerdotibus derelictis, constituere audet aliud

altare, precem alteram illicitis vocibus facere, Dominicae hostiae veritatem per falsa sacrificia profanare.

P. L. iv., 529.

Dionysius of Alexandria

In Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. Bk. VII., ch. ix.

Εὐχαριστίας γὰρ ἐπακούσαντα καὶ συνεπιφθεγξάμενον τὸ Ἀμὴν καὶ τραπέζῃ παραστάντα καὶ χεῖρας εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τῆς ἁγίας τροφῆς προτείναντα. . . . P. G. xx., 656.

Athanasius of Alexandria. 296–373 A.D.

Sermo in bapt. (Fragments)

Ὄψει τοὺς λευίτας φέροντας ἄρτους καὶ ποτήριον οἴνου, καὶ τιθέντας δὲ τὴν τράπεζαν· καὶ ὅσον οὔπω ἱκεσίαι καὶ δεήσεις γίνονται, ψιλός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος καὶ τὸ ποτήριον· ἐπ' ἂν δὲ ἐπιτελεσθῶσιν αἱ μεγάλαι καὶ θαυμασταὶ εὐχαί, τότε γίνεται ὁ ἄρτος σῶμα, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὴν τελείωσιν τῶν μυστηρίων· οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, ὅσον οὔπω εὐχαὶ καὶ ἱκεσίαι γεγόνασι, ψιλά εἰσι· ἐπ' ἂν δὲ αἱ μεγάλαι εὐχαὶ καὶ ἁγίαι ἱκεσίαι ἀναπεμφθῶσιν, καταβαίνει ὁ Λόγος εἰς τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον, καὶ γίνεται αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα.

P. G. xxvi., 1325.

Eusebius of Cæsarea. c. 260–340 A.D.

De Laudibus Constantini. Cap. xvi.

Ἀναίμους δὲ καὶ λογικὰς θυσίας τὰς δι' εὐχῶν καὶ ἀπορρήτου θεολογίας τοῖς αὐτοῦ θιασώταις τίς ἐπιτελεῖν παρέδωκεν ἄλλος ἢ μόνος ὁ ἡμέτερος Σωτήρ; P. G. xx., 1425.

Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti. Fourth century

Quaestio CIX.

Christus autem Vicarius Patris est et antistes, ac per hoc dicitur et Sacerdos. Similiter et Spiritus Sanctus quasi antistes, Sacerdos appellatus excelsi Dei, non Sum-

mus, sicut nostri in oblatione praesumunt. Quia quamvis unius sit substantiae Christus et Spiritus Sanctus, uniuscujusque tamen ordo observandus est.

P. L. xxxv., 2329.

The Sacramentary of Serapion. c. 350 A.D.

Πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ οὐρανός, πλήρης ἐστὶν καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς σου δόξης, Κύριε τῶν δυνάμεων· πλήρωσον καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τῆς σῆς μεταλήψεως· σοὶ γὰρ προσηνέγκαμεν ταύτην τὴν ζῶσαν θυσίαν τὴν προσφορὰν τὴν ἀναίμακτον.

Σοὶ προσηνέγκαμεν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ μονογενοῦς. ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος τοῦ ἁγίου σώματός ἐστιν ὁμοίωμα, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν ᾗ νυκτὶ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἑαυτοῦ λέγων· "Λάβετε καὶ φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν." διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θανάτου ποιοῦντες τὸν ἄρτον προσηνέγκαμεν, καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν διὰ τῆς θυσίας ταύτης, καταλλάγηθι πᾶσιν ἡμῖν καὶ ἱλάσθητι, Θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας· καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος ἐσκορπισμένος ἦν ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθεὶς ἐγένετο εἰς ἕν, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου ἐκκλησίαν σύναξον ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ πάσης χώρας καὶ πάσης πόλεως καὶ κώμης καὶ οἴκου καὶ ποίησον μίαν ζῶσαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

Προσηνέγκαμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ ὁμοίωμα τοῦ αἵματος, ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς λαβὼν ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι ἔλεγεν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς· "Λάβετε πίετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, ὅ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων." διὰ τοῦτο προσηνέγκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίωμα αἵματος προσάγοντες.

Ἐπιδημησάτω, Θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁ ἅγιός σου Λόγος ἐπὶ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, ἵνα γένηται ὁ ἄρτος σῶμα τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα γένηται τὸ ποτήριον αἷμα τῆς

Ἀληθείας. καὶ ποίησον πάντας τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας φάρμακον ζωῆς λαβεῖν εἰς θεραπείαν παντὸς νοσήματος καὶ εἰς ἐνδυνάμωσιν πάσης προκοπῆς καὶ ἀρετῆς, μὴ εἰς κατάκρισιν, Θεὲ τῆς ἀληθείας, μηδὲ εἰς ἔλεγχον καὶ ὄνειδος. Σὲ γὰρ τὸν ἀγένητον ἐπεκαλεσάμεθα διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι.

The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. I., 105–106.

The Liturgy of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions. c. 375 A.D.

Μεμνημένοι οὖν ὧν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεὲ παντοκράτορ, οὐχ ὅσον ὀφείλομεν ἀλλ' ὅσον δυνάμεθα καὶ τὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ πληροῦμεν. ἐν ᾗ γὰρ νυκτὶ παρεδίδοτο λαβὼν ἄρτον ταῖς ἁγίαις καὶ ἀμώμοις αὐτοῦ χερσὶ καὶ ἀναβλέψας πρὸς σὲ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Πατέρα καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἰπὼν "Τοῦτο τὸ μυστήριον τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης· λάβετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ περὶ πολλῶν θρυπτόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν." ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον κεράσας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἁγιάσας ἐπέδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· ὁσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνητε τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἐμὸν καταγγέλλετε ἄχρις ἂν ἔλθω."

Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐπανόδου καὶ τῆς μελλούσης αὐτοῦ δευτέρας παρουσίας ἐν ᾗ ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, προσφέρομέν σοι τῷ Βασιλεῖ καὶ Θεῷ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο εὐχαριστοῦντές σοι δι' αὐτοῦ ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἑστάναι ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἱερατεύειν σοι, καὶ ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως εὐμενῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου, σὺ ὁ ἀνενδεὴς Θεός, καὶ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν

τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ καταπέμψῃς τὸ Ἅγιόν σου Πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὸν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες αὐτοῦ βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων τύχωσι, τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς πλάνης αὐτοῦ ῥυσθῶσι, Πνεύματος Ἁγίου πληρωθῶσιν, ἄξιοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου γένωνται, ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσι, σοῦ καταλλαγέντος αὐτοῖς, Δέσποτα παντοκράτορ.

BRIGHTMAN, Lit. E. and W., i., 20–21.

Cyril of Jerusalem. c. 315–386 A.D.

Catecheses, XIX. (Myst. I.), 7

Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τῆς εὐχαριστίας πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἐπικλήσεως τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος ἄρτος ἦν καὶ οἶνος λιτός, ἐπικλήσεως δὲ γενομένης ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος αἷμα Χριστοῦ· τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον, κ.τ.λ. P. G. xxxiii., 1072.

Ibid., XXI. (Myst. III.), 3

Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτός, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, οὕτω, κ.τ.λ. P. G. xxxiii., 1089, 1092.

Ibid., XXIII. (Myst. V.), 4, 5, 6, 7

(4) Μετὰ τοῦτο βοᾷ ὁ ἱερεύς. Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας." . . .
. . . Εἶτα ἀποκρίνεσθε· "Ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον." . . .
(5) Εἶτα ὁ ἱερεὺς λέγει· " Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ.". . .
. . . Εἶτα λέγετε· "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον." Εὐχαριστοῦντες γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἄξιον ποιοῦμεν πρᾶγμα καὶ δίκαιον. . . .
(6) Μετὰ ταῦτα μνημονεύομεν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης, ἄστρων καὶ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως λογικῆς τε καὶ ἀλόγου, ὁρατῆς τε καὶ ἀοράτου, ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, δυνάμεων, κυριοτήτων, ἀρχῶν, ἐξουσιῶν, θρόνων, τῶν χερουβὶμ τῶν πολυπροσώπων, δυνάμει λέγοντες τὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ "Μεγαλύνατε τὸν Κύριον σὺν

ἐμοί." Μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν σεραφίμ, ἃ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἐθεάσατο Ἡσαίας παρεστηκότα κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ταῖς μὲν δυσὶ πτέρυξι κατακαλύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, ταῖς δέ δυσὶ τοὺς πόδας, καὶ ταῖς δυσὶ πετόμενα, καὶ λέγοντα· "Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος Κύριος σάβαοθ." Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐκ τῶν σεραφὶμ θεολογίαν ταύτην λέγομεν, ὅπως κοινωνοὶ τῆς ὑμνωδίας ταῖς ὑπερκοσμίοις γενώμεθα στρατιαῖς.

(7) Εἶτα, ἁγιάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων ὕμνων, παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεόν, τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ· πάντως γὰρ οὗ ἐὰν ἐφάψαιτο τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγίασται καὶ μεταβέβληται.

P. G. xxxiii., 1113, 1116.

Ibid., XXIII. (Myst. V.), 19

Μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει ὁ ἱερεύς· "Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις." ἅγια τὰ προκείμενα, ἐπιφοίτησιν δεξάμενα Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. P. G. xxxiii., 1124.

Optatus of Milevis. fl. c. 368 A.D.

De Schism. Don., Bk. VI., 1

Quid tam sacrilegum, quam altaria Dei, in quibus et vos aliquando obtulistis, frangere, radere, removere? in quibus et vota populi et membra Christi portata sunt? quo Deus omnipotens invocatus sit, quo postulatus descendit Spiritus Sanctus? unde a multis et pignus salutis aeternae et tutela fidei et spes resurrectionis accepta est? . . . Si livoris judicio nos vobis sordidi videbamur quid vobis fecerat Deus, qui illic invocari consueverat? quid vos offenderat Christus, cujus illic per certa [caetera] momenta corpus et sanguis habitabant? quid offendistis etiam vos ipsi, ut illa altaria frangeretis in quibus ante nos per longa temporum spatia, sancte (ut arbitramini) obtulistis? P. L. xi., 1064–1066.

Basil of Cæsarea. 330–378 A.D.

De Spiritu Sancto, xxvii.

Τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναδείξει τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τῆς εὐλογίας, τίς τῶν ἁγίων ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν καταλέλοιπεν; οὐ γὰρ δὴ τούτοις ἀρκούμεθα, ὧν ὁ ἀπόστολος ἢ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐπεμνήσθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ προλέγομεν καὶ ἐπιλέγομεν ἕτερα, ὡς μεγάλην ἔχοντα πρὸς τὸ μυστήριον τὴν ἰσχύν, ἐκ τῆς ἀγράφου διδασκαλίας παραλαβόντες. P. G. xxxii., 188.

Ambrose of Milan. 340–397 A.D.

De Spiritu Sancto, Bk. III., ch. xvi.

Quomodo igitur [Spiritus Sanctus] non omnia habet, quae Dei sunt, qui cum Patre et Filio a sacerdotibus in baptismate nominatur, et in oblationibus invocatur?

P. L. xvi., 837.

De Fide, Bk. IV., ch. x.

Nos autem quotiescunque sacramenta sumimus, quae per sacrae orationis mysterium in carnem transfigurantur et sanguinem, mortem Domini annuntiamus.

P. L. xvi., 667.

De Mysteriis, ix., 50, 52, 53, 54

50. Forte dicas: "Aliud video, quomodo tu mihi asseris quod Christi corpus accipiam?" Et hoc nobis adhuc superest ut probemus. Quantis igitur utimur exemplis! Probemus non hoc esse quod natura formavit, sed quod benedictio consecravit: majoremque vim esse benedictionis quam naturae; quia benedictione etiam natura ipsa mutatur.

52. Advertimus igitur majoris esse virtutis gratiam quam naturam, et adhuc tamen propheticae benedictionis numeramus gratiam. Quod si tam valuit humana benedictio, ut naturam converteret; quid dicimus de ipsa consecratione divina, ubi verba ipsa Domini Salvatoris operantur? Nam sacramentum istud quod ac-

cipis, Christi sermone conficitur. Quod si tantum valuit sermo Eliae, ut ignem de coelo deponeret: non valebit Christi sermo, ut species mutet elementorum? De totius mundi operibus legisti: "Quia ipse dixit, et facta sunt: Ipse mandavit, et creata sunt;" sermo ergo Christi qui potuit ex nihilo facere quod non erat, non potest ea quae sunt in id mutare quod non erant? Non enim minus est novas rebus dare quam mutare naturas.

53. Sed quid argumentis utimur? Suis utamur exemplis, incarnationisque exemplo astruamus mysterii veritatem. Numquid naturae usus praecessit cum Jesus Dominus ex Maria nasceretur? Si ordinem quaerimus, viro mista femina generare consuevit. Linquet igitur quod praeter naturae ordinem virgo generavit, et hoc quod conficimus corpus, ex Virgine est: quid hic quaeris naturae ordinem in Christi corpore, cum praeter naturam sit ipse Dominus Jesus partus ex Virgine? Vera utique caro Christi, quae crucifixa est, quae sepulta est: vere ergo carnis illius sacramentum est.

54. Ipse clamat Dominus Jesus: "Hoc est corpus meum." Ante benedictionem verborum coelestium alia species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus significatur. Ipse dicit sanguinem suum. Ante consecrationem aliud dicitur, post consecrationem sanguis nuncupatur. Et tu dicis: "Amen," hoc est, "Verum est." Quod os loquitur, mens interna fateatur: quod sermo sonat, affectus sentiat. P. L. xvi., 422–424.

De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum. Cap. IX., 38

Aser pinguis ejus panis, et ipse dabit escam principibus. . . . Hic ergo dives est thesaurus, hujus pinguis panis. Et bene pinguis quem qui manducaverit, esurire non poterit. Hunc panem dedit apostolis, ut dividerent populo credentium; hodieque nobis eum, quem ipse quotidie sacerdos consecrat suis verbis. Hic ergo panis factus est esca sanctorum. P. L. xiv., 719.

De Sacramentis. c. 400 A.D.

Lib. IV., iv., 14-17, 19

14. Tu forte dicis: "Meus panis est usitatus." Sed panis iste panis est ante verba sacramentorum: ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi. Hoc igitur astruamus. Quomodo potest qui panis est, corpus esse Christi? Consecratione. Consecratio autem quibus verbis est, cujus sermonibus? Domini Jesu. Nam et reliqua omnia quae dicuntur in superioribus, a sacerdote dicuntur, laudes Deo deferuntur, oratio petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro caeteris: ubi venitur ut conficiatur venerabile sacramentum, jam non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed utitur sermonibus Christi. Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit sacramentum.

15. Quis est sermo Christi? Nempe is quo facta sunt omnia. Jussit Dominus, et factum est coelum; jussit Dominus, et facta est terra; jussit Dominus, et facta sunt maria; jussit Dominus, et omnis creatura generata est. Vides ergo quam operatorius sit sermo Christi. Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent esse quae non erant, quanto magis operatorius est, ut sint quae erant, et in aliud commutentur. Coelum non erat, mare non erat, terra non erat, sed audi dicentem David: *Ipse dixit, et facta sunt; Ipse mandavit, et creata sunt.*

16. Ergo tibi ut respondeam, non erat corpus Christi ante consecrationem: sed post consecrationem dico tibi quia jam corpus est Christi. *Ipse dixit, et factum est; Ipse mandavit, et creatum est.* Tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura: postea quam consecratus es, nova creatura, esse coepisti. Vis scire quam nova creatura? *Omnis,* inquit, *in Christo nova creatura.*

17. Accipe ergo quemadmodum sermo Christi creaturam omnem mutare consueverit, et mutet, cum vult, instituta naturae. Quomodo requiris? Accipe, et primo omnium de generatione ejus sumamus exemplum.

Consuetudo est ut non generetur homo, nisi ex viro et muliere, et consuetudine conjugali; sed quia voluit Dominus, quia hoc elegit sacramentum, de Spiritu Sancto et Virgine natus est Christus, hoc est, mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus. Vides ergo quia contra instituta et ordinem natus est, homo est natus ex Virgine.

19. Ex his igitur omnibus non intelligis quantum operetur sermo coelestis? Si operatus est in fonte terreno, si operatus est sermo coelestis in aliis rebus, non operatur in coelestibus sacramentis? Ergo didicisti quod ex pane corpus fiat Christi, et quod vinum et aqua in calicem mittitur: sed fit sanguis consecratione verbi coelestis. P. L. xvi., 458–462.

IV., v., 21–25

21. Vis scire quia verbis coelestibus consecratur? Accipe quae sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos: *Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Qui pridie quam pateretur, in sanctis manibus suis accepit panem, respexit in coelum ad te, sancte Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, gratias agens, benedixit, fregit, fractumque apostolis suis et discipulis suis tradidit, dicens: Accipite, et edite ex hoc omnes; hoc est enim corpus meum, quod pro multis confringetur.*

22. *Similiter etiam calicem postquam coenatum est, pridie quam pateretur, accepit, respexit in coelum ad te, sancte Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, gratias agens, benedixit, apostolis suis et discipulis suis tradidit, dicens: Accipite, et bibite ex hoc omnes; hic est enim sanguis meus.* Vide illa omnia. Illa verba evangelistae sunt usque ad *Accipite* sive, corpus, sive sanguinem. Inde verba sunt Christi: *Accipite, et bibite ex hoc omnes; hic est enim sanguis meus.* Et vide singula.

23. *Qui pridie,* inquit, *quam pateretur, in sanctis manibus suis accepit panem.* Antequam consecratur,

panis est; ubi autem verba Christi accesserint, corpus est Christi. Denique audi dicentem: *Accipite, et edite ex eo omnes, hoc est enim corpus meum.* Et ante verba Christi, calix est, vini et aquae plenus: ubi verba Christi operata fuerint, ibi sanguis Christi efficitur, qui plebem redemit. Ergo vidite quantis generibus potens est sermo Christi universa convertere. Deinde ipse Dominus Jesus testificatur nobis quod corpus suum accipiamus et sanguinem. Numquid debemus de ejus fide et testificatione dubitare?

24. Jam redi mecum ad propositionem meam. Magnum quidem et venerabile, quod manna Judaeis pluit e coelo: sed intellige. Quid est amplius, manna de coelo, an corpus Christi? Corpus utique Christi, qui auctor est coeli. Deinde manna qui manducavit, mortuus est: qui manducaverit hoc corpus, fiet ei remissio peccatorum, et non morietur in aeternum.

25. Ergo non otiose dicis tu; *Amen*, jam in spiritu confitens quod accipias corpus Christi. Dicit tibi sacerdos: *Corpus Christi;* et tu dicis: *Amen*, hoc est, verum. Quod confitetur lingua, teneat affectus.

P. L. xvi., 462–464.

IV., vi., 26–27

26. Ut scias autem hoc esse sacramentum, hujus figura ante praecessit. Deinde quantum sit sacramentum, cognosce. Vide quid dicat: *Quotiescunque hoc feceritis, toties commemorationem mei facietis, donec iterum adveniam.*

27. Et sacerdos dicit: *Ergo memores gloriosissimae ejus passionis, et ab inferis resurrectionis, et in coelum ascensionis, offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam, rationabilem hostiam, incruentam hostiam, hunc panem sanctum, et calicem vitae aeternae: et petimus et precamur, ut hanc oblationem suscipias in sublimi altari tuo per manus angelorum tuorum, sicut suscipere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi Abel, et sacrificium patriarchae nostri Abrahae, et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos Melchisedech.*

P. L. xvi., 464.

John Chrysostom. 347–407 A.D.

De Sacerdotio, Bk. III., ch. 4

Βούλει καὶ ἐξ ἑτέρου θαύματος τῆς ἁγιστείας ἰδεῖν τὴν ὑπερβολήν; ὑπόγραψόν μοι Ἠλίαν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ τὸν ἄπειρον ὄχλον περιεστῶτα, καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ἐπὶ τῶν λίθων κειμένην, καὶ πάντας μὲν ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ τοὺς λοιπούς, καὶ πολλῇ τῇ σιγῇ, μόνον δὲ τὸν προφήτην εὐχόμενον· εἶτα ἐξαίφνης τὴν φλόγα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ἱερεῖον ῥιπτομένην· θαυμαστὰ ταῦτα, καὶ πάσης ἐκπλήξεως γέμοντα· μετάβηθι τοίνυν ἐκεῖθεν ἐπὶ τὰ νῦν τελούμενα καὶ οὐ θαυμαστὰ μόνον ὄψει, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαν ἔκπληξιν ὑπερβαίνοντα. Ἕστηκε γὰρ ὁ ἱερεύς, οὐ πῦρ καταφέρων, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον· καὶ τὴν ἱκετηρίαν ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται, οὐχ ἵνα τις λαμπὰς ἄνωθεν ἀφεθεῖσα καταναλώσῃ τὰ προκείμενα, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ χάρις ἐπιπεσοῦσα τῇ θυσίᾳ δι' ἐκείνης τὰς ἁπάντων ἀνάψῃ ψυχάς, καὶ ἀργυρίου λαμπροτέρας ἀποδείξῃ πεπυρωμένου. P. G. xlviii., 642.

Ibid., VI., 4

Ὅταν δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον καλῇ καὶ τὴν φρικωδεστάτην ἐπιτελῇ θυσίαν, καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων συνεχῶς ἐφάπτηται Δεσπότου, ποῦ τάξομεν αὐτόν, εἰπέ μοι; . . . ἐννόησον γὰρ ὁποίας τὰς ταῦτα διακονουμένας χεῖρας εἶναι χρή, ὁποίαν τὴν γλῶτταν τὴν ἐκεῖνα προχέουσαν τὰ ῥήματα, τίνος δὲ οὐ καθαρωτέραν καὶ ἁγιωτέραν τὴν τοσοῦτον Πνεῦμα ὑποδεξαμένην ψυχήν. P. G. xlviii., 681.

De coemeterio et cruce, 3

Τί ποιεῖς, ἄνθρωπε; ὅταν ἑστήκῃ πρὸ τῆς τραπέζης ὁ ἱερεύς, τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείνων εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καλῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον τοῦ παραγενέσθαι καὶ ἅψεσθαι τῶν προκειμένων, πολλὴ ἡσυχία, πολλὴ σιγή. Ὅταν διδῷ τὴν χάριν τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὅταν κατέλθῃ, ὅταν ἅψηται τῶν προκειμένων, ὅταν ἴδῃς τὸ πρόβατον ἐσφαγιασμένον καὶ ἀπηρτισμένον, τότε θόρυβον, τότε ταραχήν, τότε φιλονεικίαν, τότε λοιδορίαν, ἐπεισάγεις; P. G. xlix., 397, 398.

Hom. in Pentecost. l.

Ἀναμιμνήσκοντες αὐτούς, ὅτι οὐδὲν αὐτὸς ὁ παρὼν πράττει, οὐδὲ ἀνθρωπίνης ἐστι φύσεως κατορθώματα τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα, ἀλλ' ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις παροῦσα, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφιπταμένη, τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκείνην κατασκευάζει θυσίαν· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ὁ παρών, ἀλλ' ὁ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν δι' αὐτοῦ· μὴ τοίνυν πρόσεχε τῇ φύσει τοῦ ὁρωμένου, ἀλλ' ἐννόει τὴν χάριν τὴν ἀόρατον· οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπινον τῶν γενομένων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τούτῳ βήματι.

P. G. l., 459.

Hom. xlv. in Joan.

Καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνη ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου διὰ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον ἄρτος ἐστίν· ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος διὰ τὸ ἐπιφοιτᾶν αὐτῷ Πνεῦμα, ἄρτος οὐράνιος γίνεται. P. G. lix., 253.

Hom. ii. on 2 Timoth.

Ἡ προσφορὰ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι, κἂν τυχὼν προσενέγκῃ, κἂν Παῦλος, κἂν Πέτρος· ἡ αὐτή ἐστιν, ἣν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἔδωκε, καὶ ἣν νῦν οἱ ἱερεῖς ποιοῦσιν· οὐδὲν αὕτη ἐλάττων ἐκείνης, ὅτι καὶ ταύτην οὐκ ἄνθρωποι ἁγιάζουσιν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ καὶ ἐκείνην ἁγιάσας. Ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ῥήματα, ἅπερ ὁ Θεὸς ἐφθέγξατο, τὰ αὐτά ἐστιν, ἅπερ ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ νῦν λέγει, οὕτω καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ ἡ αὐτή ἐστιν.

P. G. lxii., 612.

Hom. i., de prodit. Jud., 6

Πάρεστιν ὁ Χριστός, καὶ νῦν ἐκεῖνος ὁ τὴν τράπεζαν διακοσμήσας ἐκείνην, οὗτος καὶ ταύτην διακοσμεῖ νῦν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ὁ ποιῶν τὰ προκείμενα γενέσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστός. Σχῆμα πληρῶν ἕστηκεν ὁ ἱερεύς, τὰ ῥήματα φθεγγόμενος ἐκεῖνα· ἡ δὲ δύναμις καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι. "Τοῦτό μού ἐστι τὸ σῶμα," φησί· Τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταρρυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα· καὶ καθάπερ ἡ φωνὴ ἐκείνη ἡ λέγουσα· "Αὐξάνεσθε, καὶ πληθύνεσθε, καὶ πληρώσατε

τὴν γῆν," ἐρρέθη μὲν ἅπαξ, διὰ παντὸς δὲ τοῦ χρόνου γίνεται ἔργῳ ἐνδυναμοῦσα τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμετέραν πρὸς παιδοποιΐαν· οὕτω καὶ ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη ἅπαξ λεχθεῖσα καθ' ἑκάστην τράπεζαν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐξ ἐκείνου μέχρι σήμερον καὶ μέχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, τὴν θυσίαν ἀπηρτισμένην ἐργάζεται.

P. G. xlix., 380.

Hom. ii., de prodit. Jud., 6

Πάρεστιν καὶ νῦν ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν τράπεζαν κοσμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ὁ ποιῶν τὰ προκείμενα γενέσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Σχῆμα πληρῶν μόνον ἕστηκεν ὁ ἱερεύς, καὶ δέησιν προσφέρει· ἡ δὲ χάρις καὶ ἡ δύναμίς ἐστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ πάντα ἐργαζομένη. "Τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα," φησί. Τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα τὰ προκείμενα μεταρρυθμίζει. καὶ καθάπερ ἐκείνη ἡ φωνή, ἡ λέγουσα, "Αὐξάνεσθε, καὶ πληθύνεσθε, καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν," ῥῆμα ἦν, καὶ ἐγένετο ἔργον, ἐνδυναμοῦσα τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν πρὸς παιδοποιΐαν· οὕτω καὶ αὕτη ἡ φωνή, ἡ λέγουσα, διαπαντὸς αὔξει τῇ χάριτι τοὺς ἀξίως μετέχοντας.

P. G. xlix., 389, 390.

Ephraem Syrus. c. 308–c. 378 A.D.

De Sacerdotio

Ἡ δὲ ἱερωσύνη εὐπαρρησιάστως ὑψιπετεῖ ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς οὐρανόν, ἄχρις ἂν θεωρήσῃ αὐτὸν τὸν ἀόρατον· καὶ προσκυνήσασα εὔχεται . . . ὅπως τὸ παράκλητον Πνεῦμα συγκαθέλθῃ, καὶ ἁγιάσῃ δῶρα, τὰ ἐν γῇ προκείμενα· καὶ ὅταν προσκομιασθῇ μυστήρια φοβερὰ πλήρης ἀθανασίας διὰ τοῦ προεστῶτος ἱερέως ποιοῦντος πρεσβείαν ὑπὲρ πάντων. τότε δὴ προσέρχονται ψυχαὶ διὰ τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων καθαρμὸν λαμβάνουσαι τῶν σπίλων· ἴδετε, φιλόθεοι, πῶς οὐκ ἐνεργοῦσι τὰ δύο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἰ μὴ ἡ οὐράνια ψῆφος παραγένηται καὶ ἁγιάσει τὰ δῶρα.

Opera omnia, ed. Pet. Ben., gr.-lat., iii., 2, 3.

De sanct. et viv. ch. sacr.

Ne putes quem hic panem quodque vinum vides, eadem haec existere. Minime frater: nolito hoc credere. Precibus sacerdotis Sanctique Spiritus adventu panis fit corpus, vinum sanguis. . . . Quomodo is quaeso ipse efficere non possit, ut panis ipsum corpus Christi, vinum sanguis ipsius sit? Principio terrae mandavit herbam producere; quae propterea in hanc usque horam, pluviam mittente coelo, vi divini, quod initio accepit, mandati, herbam emittit. Jam vero simili modo Deus dicit, "Hoc est corpus meum," "Hic est sanguis meus," et "Hoc facite in memoriam mei." Cum igitur omnia omnipotenti ejus jussu fiant: usque dum ipse veniat, prout ipse ait; "dum venio:" cumque pluvia in terram decidente, gramen revirescat: tum vero et spiritualis haec pluvia, hoc est Spiritus Sanctus, sacerdotis precibus ipsius efficacia accedens panem hunc corpus et vinum sanguinem aperte efficit. Opera omnia, ed. Pet. Ben., gr.-lat., iii., 608, 609.

Explanatio in Ezek. x.

Istae prunae lineisque amictus vir illas extrahens et super populum profundens, figura fuit Dei sacerdotum, per quos prunae viventis et vivificantis corporis Domini nostri dispensantur; porro dum alter angelus manum porrigit, prunas legit et viro lineis induto mox tradit, mysterium innuit, non ab ipso sacerdote ex pane fieri posse corpus, sed ab alio; hic est autem Spiritus Sanctus; sacerdotem itaque velut mediatorem solummodo manus attollere, labiisque preces et orationes quasi supplicem servum offere. Opera omnia, ed. Pet. Ben., syr.-lat., ii., 175.

Peter II. of Alexandria. † 381 A.D.

Theodoret, Hist. Eccl., iv., 19

. . . τοῦ ἁγίου θυσιαστηρίου ἔνθα κάθοδον τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπικαλούμεθα. P. G. lxxxii., 1169.

Gregory of Nyssa. c. 330–395 A.D.

De Bapt. Christi

Ὁ ἄρτος πάλιν, ἄρτος ἔστι τέως κοινός, ἀλλ' ὅταν αὐτὸν τὸ μυστήριον ἱερουργήσῃ, σῶμα Χριστοῦ λέγεταί τε καὶ γίνεται· οὕτω καὶ τὸ μυστικὸν ἔλαιον, οὕτως ὁ οἶνος, ὀλίγου τινὸς ἄξια ὄντα πρὸ τῆς εὐλογίας, μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐνεργεῖ διαφόρως.

P. G. xlvi., 582.

Epist. can. ad Let. epis. Melit.

Εἴ τις ἠρνήσατο τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ πίστιν . . . αὐτομολήσας ἐφάνη· ὁ μὲν ἑκουσίως ἐπὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον ὁρμήσας κακόν, εἶτα καταγνοὺς ἑαυτοῦ, χρόνον τὸν τῆς μετανοίας ἔχει ὅλον τὸν τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ· οὐδέποτε γὰρ μυστικῆς ἐπιτελουμένης εὐχῆς, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ προσκυνῆσαι τὸν Θεὸν καταξιοῦται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μόνας μὲν εὔξεται, τῆς δὲ κοινωνίας τῶν ἁγιασμάτων καθόλου ἀλλότριος ἔσται· ἐν δὲ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς ἐξόδου αὐτοῦ, τότε τῆς τοῦ ἁγιάσματος ἀξιωθήσεται.

P. G. xlv., 225.

In laudem fratris Basilii

Ἡ ἱερωσύνη τοῦ διδασκάλου μιμεῖται τὰ τῆς ἱερωσύνης τοῦ προφήτου Ἠλιοὺ αἰνίγματα, διὰ τοῦ τρισσεύειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς πίστεως τὸ οὐράνιον πῦρ πρὸς τὰς ἱερουργίας ἐφελκομένη· πῦρ δὲ τὴν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος δύναμιν καλεῖσθαι πολλαχῇ παρὰ τῆς γραφῆς ἐδιδάχθημεν.

P. G. xlvi., 805.

Oratio Catechetica, 33

Ἐπειδὰν οὖν τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀκούσωσιν καὶ προδιδαχθῶσι τὸν τρόπον, ὅτι εὐχὴ πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ χάριτος οὐρανίας ἐπίκλησις καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ πίστις ἐστὶ δι' ὧν τὸ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως πληροῦται μυστήριον, δυσπειθῶς ἔχουσι πρὸς τὸ φαινόμενον βλέποντες, ὡς οὐ συμβαῖνον τῇ ἐπαγγελίᾳ τὸ σωματικῶς ἐνεργούμενον. Πῶς γάρ, φασίν, εὐχὴ καὶ δυνάμεως θείας ἐπίκλησις ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος γινομένη ζωῆς ἀρχηγὸς τοῖς μυηθεῖσι γίνεται;

ed. Srawley, pp. 123–124. P. G. xlv., 84.

Oratio Catechetica, 36

Τίς γὰρ πάρεστι πόνος τῷ πράγματι, πιστεῦσαι παντα-χοῦ τὸν Θεὸν εἶναι, ἐν πᾶσι δὲ ὄντα, παρεῖναι καὶ τοῖς ἐπι-καλουμένοις τὴν ζωτικὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν, παρόντα δὲ τὸ οἰκεῖον ποιεῖν; ed. Srawley, p. 140. P. G. xlv., 92.

Ibid., 37

Τὸ γὰρ πάντων ἴδιον καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνης τῆς σαρκὸς ὡμολο-γήθη, ὅτι ἄρτῳ κἀκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα διεκρατεῖτο, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τῇ ἐνοικήσει τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου πρὸς τὴν θεικὴν ἀξίαν μετε-ποιήθη. Καλῶς οὖν καὶ νῦν τὸν τῷ Λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁγιαζό-μενον ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι πιστεύομεν. Καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα ἄρτος τῇ δυνάμει ἦν, ἡγιάσθη δὲ τῇ ἐπισκηνώσει τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ σκηνώσαντος ἐν τῇ σαρκί. Οὐκοῦν ὅθεν ὁ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ σώματι μετα-ποιηθεὶς ἄρτος εἰς θείαν μετέστη δύναμιν, διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ νῦν τὸ ἴσον γίνεται. Ἐκεῖ τε γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Λόγου χάρις ἅγιον ἐποίει τὸ σῶμα ᾧ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἡ σύστασις ἦν, καὶ τρόπον τινὰ καὶ αὐτὸ ἄρτος ἦν· ἐνταῦθά τε ὡσαύτως ὁ ἄρτος, καθὼς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, "ἁγιάζεται διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως," οὐ διὰ βρώσεως προιὼν εἰς τὸ σῶμα γενέσθαι τοῦ Λόγου, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς πρὸς τὸ σῶμα διὰ τοῦ Λόγου μεταποιούμενος, καθὼς εἴρηται ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου ὅτι "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου." . . . Ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἡ θεοδόχος ἐκείνη σὰρξ πρὸς τὴν σύστασιν ἑαυτῆς παρεδέξατο, ὁ δὲ φανερωθεὶς Θεὸς διὰ τοῦτο κατέμιξεν ἑαυτὸν τῇ ἐπικήρῳ φύσει, ἵνα τῇ τῆς θεότητος κοινωνίᾳ συναποθεωθῇ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, τούτου χάριν πᾶσι τοῖς πεπι-στευκόσι τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ τῆς χάριτος ἑαυτὸν ἐνσπείρει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ἧς ἡ σύστασις ἐξ οἴνου τε καὶ ἄρτου ἐστί, τοῖς σώμασι τῶν πεπιστευκότων κατακιρνάμενος, ὡς ἂν τῇ πρὸς τὸ ἀθάνατον ἑνώσει καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀφθαρσίας μέτοχος γένοιτο. Ταῦτα δὲ διδωσι τῇ τῆς εὐλογίας δυνάμει πρὸς ἐκεῖνο μεταστοιχειώσας τῶν φαινομένων τὴν φύσιν.

ed. Srawley, pp. 148–152. P. G. xlv., 97.

Theophilus of Alexandria

Paschal letter, 402 A.D.

Dicit [Origenes] enim, Spiritum Sanctum non operari ea quae inanima sunt, nec ad irrationabilia pervenire. Quod asserens non recogitat, aquas in baptismate mysticas adventu Sancti Spiritus consecrari, panemque dominicum, quo Salvatoris corpus ostenditur (= *ἀναδείκνυται*) et quem frangimus in sanctificationem nostri et sacrum calicem (quae in mensa ecclesiae collocantur et utique inanima sunt) per invocationem et adventum Sancti Spiritus sanctificari (= *διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἁγιάζεσθαι*). P. L. xxii., 801.

Nilus. † c. 430 A.D.

Epist. ad Phil. Schol., i., 44

Ἐκ παπύρου καὶ κόλλης χάρτης κατασκευασθεὶς χάρτης ψιλὸς καλεῖται· ἐπὰν δὲ ὑπογραφὴν δέξηται βασιλέως δῆλος ὡς σάκρα ὀνομάζεται. οὕτως μοι νόει καὶ τὰ θεῖα μυστήρια πρὸ μὲν τῆς ἐντεύξεως τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ τῆς καθόδου τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ψιλὸν ἄρτον ὑπάρχειν καὶ οἶνον κοινὸν τὰ προκείμενα, μετὰ δὲ τὰς φοβερὰς ἐκείνας ἐπικλήσεις καὶ τὴν ἐπιφοίτησιν τοῦ προσκυνητοῦ καὶ ζωοποιοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ Πνεύματος οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν ἄρτον καὶ κοινὸν οἶνον τὰ ἐπιτεθεμένα τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ, ἀλλὰ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τίμιον, καὶ ἄχραντον εἶναι Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν ἁπάντων, καθαρίζον ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας φόβῳ καὶ πόθῳ πολλῷ. P. G. lxxix., 104.

Augustine. 354–430 A.D.

Hom. 227, in die Pasch. iv.

Panis ille quem videtis in altari, sanctificatus per Verbum Dei, corpus est Christi. Calix ille, imo quod habet calix, sanctificatum per Verbum Dei sanguis Christi. Attendite ergo, et videte, quia venturus est Pentecosto Spiritus Sanctus, . . . Accedit ergo Spiritus

Sanctus, post aquam ignis; efficimini panis, quod est corpus Christi.

Tenetis sacramenta ordine suo. Primo, post orationem admonemini sursum habere cor . . . respondetis "Habemus ad Dominum" . . . sequitur episcopus, vel presbyter qui offert: "Grâtias agamus Domino Deo nostro." . . . Et vos attestamini, "Dignum et justum est." . . . Deinde post sanctificationem sacrificii Dei . . . ubi peracta est sanctificatio, dicimus Dominicam orationem. P. L. xxxviii., 1099–1101.

Sermones inediti. III. De Sacramento altaris ad infantes

Ipse namque sua jam propinquante passione, cum Pascha faceret cum Discipulis suis, acceptum panem, benedixit, et ait: *Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur.* Similiter benedictum calicem dedit dicens: *Hic est sanguis meus Novi Testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.* P. L. xlvi., 905–906.

Ibid. VI. Item de Sacramento altaris ad infantes

1. Hoc quod videtis panis est, et vinum; sed iste panis, et hoc vinum accedente Verbo fit corpus, et sanguis Verbi.

3. Et inde jam [sequuntur] quae aguntur in precibus sanctis, quas audituri estis, ut accedente Verbo fiat corpus et sanguis Christi. Nam tolle Verbum, panis est et vinum. Adde Verbum, et jam aliud est. Et ipsum aliud quid est? Corpus Christi et sanguis Christi. Tolle ergo Verbum, panis est, et vinum. Adde Verbum, et fiet sacramentum. Ad hoc dicitis: *Amen.* Amen dicere subscribere est. Amen latine interpretatur Verum.
P. L. xlvi., 834–835, 836.

Epist. cxlix., ad Paulin., 16

Eligo in his verbis hoc intelligere, quod omnis vel paene omnis frequentat ecclesia: ut precationes accipiamus

dictas, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud quod est in Domini mensa incipiat benedici: orationes, cum benedicitur et sanctificatur, et ad distribuendum comminuitur: quam totam petitionem fere omnis ecclesia Dominica oratione concludit.

P. L. xxxiii., 636–637.

De Trinitate, Bk. III., ch. iv., § 10

Apostolus Paulus . . . potuit tamen significando praedicare Dominum Jesum Christum, aliter per linguam suam, aliter per epistolam, aliter per sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus. Nec linguam, quippe ejus nec membranas, nec atramentum, nec significantes sonos lingua editos, nec signa litterarum conscripta pelliculis, corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus, sed illud tantum, quod ex fructibus terrae acceptum et prece mystica consecratum, rite sumimus ad salutem spiritalem in memoriam pro nobis dominicae passionis. Quod cum per manus hominum ad illam visibilem speciem perducitur, non sanctificatur, ut sit tam magnum sacramentum, nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.

P. L. xlii., 873–874.

Jerome. 345–420 A.D.

Epist. cxlvi., ad Evang.

Nam cum Apostolus perspicue doceat eosdem esse presbyteros quos episcopos, quid patitur mensarum et viduarum minister, ut supra eos se tumidus effereat, ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisque conficitur?

P. L. xxii., 1193.

In Soph. iii.

Sacerdotes quoque qui eucharistiae serviunt et sanguinem Domini populis ejus dividunt, impie agunt in legem Christi putantes εὐχαριστίαν imprecantis facere verba, non vitam, et necessariam esse tantum solemnem orationem, et non sacerdotum merita, de quibus dicitur:

"Et sacerdos, in quo fuerit macula, non accedat offerre oblationes Domino." P. L. xxv., 1375.

The Greek Jerome. fl. c. 400 A.D.

Com. Christ. cui. util.

Ὅθεν καὶ πληροφορεῖται ὁ Χριστιανός, οὐ ψιλὸν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀλλὰ σῶμα ἀληθῶς καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἡγιασμένον.

P. G. xl., 864.

Isidore of Pelusium. † c. 434 A.D.

Epist. i., 109

Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἐνανθρωπήσας παρέδωκε, συμπληρωτικὸν εἶναι τῆς θείας Τριάδος τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπικλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, ὡς ἐλευθεροῦν τῶν ἁμαρτίων ἀριθμούμενον, καὶ ἐπὶ τραπέζης τῆς μυστικῆς τὸν ἄρτον τὸν κοινὸν σῶμα ἰδικὸν τῆς αὐτοῦ σαρκώσεως ἀποφαῖνον· πῶς διδάσκεις, ἐμβρόντητε, ποιητὸν ἢ κτιστὸν ἢ τῆς δούλης φύσεως εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς δεσποτικῆς καὶ δημιουργοῦ καὶ βασιλίδος οὐσίας σύγγενες καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον;

P. G. lxxviii., 256.

Epist. i., 313

Μὴ ὕβριζε τὴν θείαν λειτουργίαν, μὴ ἀτίμαζε τὴν τῶν καρπῶν εὐλογίαν. . . . Ἀλλὰ μεμνημένος ὡς αἷμα Χριστοῦ τὴν τούτου ἐπαρχὴν τὸ θεῖον ἐργάζεται Πνεῦμα οὕτως αὐτῷ κέχρησο ὡς ἀσθενής. P. G. lxxviii., 364.

Cyril of Alexandria. † 444 A.D.

In Luc. xxii., 19

Εὐχαριστεῖ μὲν τουτέστιν ἐν σχήματι προσευχῆς διαλέγεται τῷ Θεῷ Πατρὶ κοινωνὸν ὥσπερ αὐτὸν καὶ συνευδοκητὴν ἀποφαίνων τῆς δοθησομένης ἡμῖν εὐλογίας ζωοποιοῦ· πᾶσα γὰρ χάρις καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἔρχεται παρὰ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι· τύπος δὲ ἦν τὸ

δρώμενον εἰς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς τῆς ὀφειλούσης προσανατείνεσθαι λιτῆς εἰ μέλλοι προτίθεσθαι παρ' ἡμῶν τῆς μυστικῆς καὶ ζωοποιοῦ δωροφορίας ἡ χάρις ὃ δὴ καὶ δρᾶν εἰθίσμεθα.

P. G. lxxii., 908.

In Luc. ix., 16

Βλέπει τε εἰς οὐρανόν, οἷον τὴν ἄνωθεν εὐλογίαν αἰτῶν.

P. G. lxxii., 645.

In Joan. Lib. III., c. iv. (ch. vi., 11)

Οὕτως καὶ ἐνταῦθα τό, εὐλογήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρτων, νοεῖται. Σημειωτέον ὅτι, ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, εἶπεν ὁ Ματθαῖος· οὐδαμῶς δὲ διαφωνήσει τῶν ἁγίων ἡ ἔκδοσις· ἐν γὰρ ἀποδείξει τὸ συναμφότερον ὁ Παῦλος, εἰπών· "ὅτι πᾶν βρῶμα καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον, μετ' εὐχαριστίας λαμβάνομεν· ἁγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως·" εὐλογεῖται γὰρ πάντως τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον διὰ τῆς ἐν ἐντεύξει προσευχῆς, ἣν ἐπὶ ταῖς τραπέζαις ἀεὶ ποιεῖν εἰθίσμεθα.

P. G. lxxiii., 456.

In Matt. xxvi., 26 seq.

Ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν τύπον δίδους πρῶτον εὐχαριστεῖν καὶ οὕτω κλᾶν τὸν ἄρτον καὶ διαδιδόναι· διὸ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπ' ὄψεσι Θεοῦ τὰ προκείμενα τίθεντες δεόμεθα ἐκτενῶς εἰς εὐλογίαν ἡμῖν μεταπλασθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν ἵνα μετασχόντες αὐτῶν ἁγιασθῶμεν σωματικῶς καὶ πνευματικῶς.

P. G. lxxii., 452.

Epist. oecum. ad Nest. ii.

Καταγγέλλοντες τὸν κατὰ σάρκα θάνατον τοῦ μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τουτέστιν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τήν τε ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναβίωσιν καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν ὁμολογοῦντες, τὴν ἀναίμακτον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τελοῦμεν θυσίαν, πρόσιμέν τε οὕτω ταῖς μυστικαῖς εὐλογίαις καὶ ἁγιαζόμεθα μέτοχοι γινόμενοι τῆς τε ἁγίας σαρκὸς καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος τοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν Σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ. P. G. lxxvii., 113.

Proclus. † c. 447 A.D.

De tradit. div. litur.

Διὰ τοιούτων τοίνυν εὐχῶν τὴν ἐπιφοίτησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος προσεδόκουν, ὅπως τῇ αὐτοῦ θείᾳ παρουσίᾳ τὸν προκείμενον εἰς ἱερουργίαν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον ὕδατι μεμιγμένον, αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀποφήνῃ τε καὶ ἀναδείξῃ. P. G. lxv., 851.

Gaudentius of Brescia. fl. c. 420 A.D.

Serm. ii.

Ne terrenum putes, quod coeleste effectum est per eum qui transit in illud et fecit illud suum corpus et sanguinem . . . ut per ignem divini Spiritus id effectum, quod annuntiatum est, credas, quia quod accipis, corpus est illius Panis coelestis et sanguis illius sacrae Vitis. Nam cum panem consecratum et vinum discipulis suis porrigeret, sic ait: "Hoc est corpus meum," "Hic est sanguis meus." P. L. xx., 858.

Theodoret of Cyrus. † 458 A.D.

Dial. ii., Inconfusus

ΟΡΘ. *Εἶπε τοίνυν, τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα παρὰ τῶν ἱερωμένων τῷ Θεῷ προσφερόμενα, τίνων ἐστὶ σύμβολα;*

ΕΡΑΝ. *Τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ σώματός τε καὶ αἵματος.*

Ο. *Τοῦ ὄντως σώματος ἢ οὐκ ὄντως;*

Ε. *Τοῦ ὄντος.*

Ο. *Ἄριστα· χρὴ γὰρ εἶναι τὸ τῆς εἰκόνος ἀρχέτυπον. Καὶ γὰρ οἱ ζωγράφοι τὴν φύσιν μιμοῦνται, καὶ τῶν ὁρωμένων γράφουσι τὰς εἰκόνας.*

Ε. *Ἀληθές.*

Ο. *Εἰ τοίνυν τοῦ ὄντως σώματος ἀντίτυπά ἐστι τὰ θεῖα μυστήρια, σῶμα ἄρα ἐστὶ καὶ νῦν τοῦ Δεσπότου τὸ σῶμα, οὐκ εἰς θεότητος φύσιν μεταβληθὲν ἀλλὰ θείας δόξης ἀναπλησθέν.*

Ε. *Εἰς καιρὸν τὸν περὶ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἐκίνησας λόγον· ἐντεῦθέν σοι γὰρ δείξω τοῦ Δεσπο-*

τικοῦ σώματος τὴν εἰς ἑτέραν φύσιν μεταβολήν. Ἀπόκριναι τοίνυν πρὸς τὰς ἐμὰς ἐρωτήσεις.

O. Ἀποκρινοῦμαι.

E. Τὶ καλεῖς τὸ προσφερόμενον δῶρον πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως ;

O. Οὐ χρὴ σαφῶς εἰπεῖν· εἰκὸς γάρ τινας ἀμυήτους παρεῖναι.

E. Αἰνιγματωδῶς ἡ ἀπόκρισις ἔστω.

O. Τὴν ἐκ τοιῶνδε σπερμάτων τροφήν.

E. Τὸ δὲ ἕτερον σύμβολον πῶς ὀνομάζομεν ;

O. Κοινὸν καὶ τοῦτο ὄνομα πόματος εἶδος σημαῖνον.

E. Μετὰ δέ γε τὸν ἁγιασμόν, πῶς ταῦτα προσαγορεύεις ;

O. Σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ.

E. Καὶ πιστεύεις γε σώματος Χριστοῦ μεταλαμβάνειν καὶ αἵματος ;

O. Οὕτω πιστεύω.

E. Ὥσπερ τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ σώματός τε καὶ αἵματος, ἄλλα μέν εἰσι πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως, μετὰ δέ γε τὴν ἐπίκλησιν μεταβάλλεται, καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται· οὕτω τὸ Δεσποτικὸν σῶμα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν μεταβλήθη τὴν θείαν.

O. Ἑάλως, αἷς ὕφηνας ἄρκυσι· οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως, μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἴδους καὶ ὁρατά εἰσι, καὶ ἁπτά, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν· νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ ἐγένετο καὶ πιστεύεται, καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα, ἅπερ πιστεύεται.

P. G. lxxxiii., 165, 168.

The Liturgy of St. James

Brightman, Lit. E. and W., Vol. I., pp. 51–54

Ὕστερον δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν μονογενῆ σου Υἱὸν τὸν Κύριον

ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐξαποστείλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα ἐλθὼν τὴν σὴν ἀνανεώσῃ καὶ ἀνεγείρῃ εἰκόνα· ὃς κατελθὼν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθεὶς ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου καὶ θεοτόκου συναναστραφείς τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πάντα ᾠκονόμησε πρὸς σωτηρίαν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν, μέλλων δὲ τὸν ἑκούσιον καὶ ζωοποιὸν διὰ σταυροῦ θάνατον ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καταδέχεσθαι, ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδοτο, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑαυτὸν παρεδίδου, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας

εἶτα ὁ ἱερεὺς τῇ χειρὶ τὸν ἄρτον κατασχὼν λέγει

λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀχράντων καὶ ἀμώμων καὶ ἀθανάτων αὐτοῦ χειρῶν, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρί, εὐχαριστήσας ἁγιάσας κλάσας ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις εἰπών

λέγουσιν οἱ διάκονοι

Εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον

εἶτα ἐκφωνεῖ

Λάβετε φάγετε· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον καὶ διδόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν

ὁ λαός

Ἀμήν

εἶτα λαμβάνει τὸ ποτήριον καὶ λέγει καθ' ἑαυτόν

ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον καὶ κεράσας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρί, εὐχαριστήσας ἁγιάσας εὐλογήσας πλήσας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ μακαρίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς εἰπὼν

[εἶτα ἐκφωνεῖ]

Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον καὶ διαδιδόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν

ὁ λαός

Ἀμήν

ὁ ἱερεύς

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· ὁσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καταγγέλλετε καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ ὁμολογεῖτε ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ

λέγουσιν οἱ διάκονοι

Πιστεύομεν καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν

ὁ λαός

Τὸν θάνατόν σου Κύριε καταγγέλλομεν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασίν σου ὁμολογοῦμεν.

Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπισυνάπτει εὐχήν

Μεμνημένοι οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τῶν ζωοποιῶν αὐτοῦ παθημάτων, τοῦ σωτηρίου σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ταφῆς καὶ τῆς τριημέρου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνόδου καὶ τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθέδρας καὶ τῆς δευτέρας ἐνδόξου καὶ φοβερᾶς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας ὅταν ἔλθῃ μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ὅταν μέλλῃ ἀποδιδόναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· φεῖσαι ἡμῶν Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν εὐσπλαγχνίαν αὐτοῦ προσφέρομέν σοι Δέσποτα τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν δεόμενοι ἵνα μὴ κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ποιήσῃς μεθ' ἡμῶν μηδὲ κατὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν ἀνταποδώσῃς ἡμῖν ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἐπιείκειαν καὶ ἄφατόν σου φιλανθρωπίαν ὑπερβὰς καὶ ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τῶν σῶν ἱκετῶν χαρίσῃ ἡμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ αἰώνιά σου δωρήματα ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσε καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασας ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσί σε, καὶ μὴ δι' ἐμὲ καὶ διὰ τὰς ἐμὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀθετήσῃς τὸν λαὸν φιλάνθρωπε Κύριε

ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκ τρίτου

Ὁ γὰρ λαός σου καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία σου ἱκετεύει σε

ὁ λαός

Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ

πάλιν λέγει ὁ ἱερεύς

Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου καὶ ἐξαπόστειλον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον

εἶτα κλίνας τὸν αὐχένα λέγει

τὸ Κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ σύνθρονόν σοι τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ μονογενεῖ σου Υἱῷ, τὸ συμβασιλεῦον, τὸ ὁμοούσιόν τε καὶ συναΐδιον, τὸ λαλῆσαν ἐν νόμῳ καὶ προφηταῖς καὶ τῇ καινῇ σου διαθήκῃ, τὸ καταβὰν ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ καὶ μεῖναν ἐπ' αὐτόν, τὸ καταβὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους σου ἀποστόλους ἐν εἴδει πυρίνων γλωσσῶν ἐν τῷ ὑπερῴῳ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἐνδόξου Σιὼν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἁγίας πεντηκοστῆς

καὶ ἀνιστάμενος λέγει καθ' ἑαυτόν

αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον κατάπεμψον, Δέσποτα, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα

ἐκφώνησις

ἵνα ἐπιφοιτῆσαν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ ἁγιάσῃ καὶ ποιῇ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἅγιον Χριστοῦ

ὁ λαός

Ἀμήν

ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφωνεῖ

καὶ τὸ ποτηριον τοῦτο αἷμα τίμιον Χριστοῦ

ὁ λαός

Ἀμήν

εἶτα λέγει καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἱστάμενος

ἵνα γένηται πᾶσι τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, εἰς ἁγιασμὸν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, εἰς καρποφορίαν ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, κ.τ.λ.

Pope Gelasius I. † 496 A.D.

Epistle to Elpidius

Sacrosancta religio, quae catholicam tenet disciplinam,

tantam sibi reverentiam vindicat, ut ad eam quilibet nisi pura conscientia non audeat pervenire. Nam quomodo ad divini mysterii consecrationem coelestis Spiritus invocatus adveniet, si sacerdos et qui eum adesse deprecatur, criminosis plenus actionibus reprobetur.

Mansi, VIII., 139.

Fulgentius of Ruspe. † 533 A.D.

Ad Monimum, II., 6

Iam nunc etiam illa nobis est de Spiritus Sancti missione quaestio revolvenda: cur scilicet, si omni Trinitati sacrificium offertur, ad sanctificandum oblationis nostrae munus Sancti Spiritus tantum missio postuletur, quasi vero, ut ita dicam, ipse Pater Deus, a quo Spiritus Sanctus procedit, sacrificium sibi oblatum sanctificare non potest, aut ipse Filius sanctificare nequeat sacrificium corporis sui, quod offerimus nos, cum corpus suum ipse sanctificaverit, quod obtulit, ut redimeret nos; aut ita Spiritus Sanctus ad consecrandum ecclesiae sacrificium mittendus sit, tanquam Pater aut Filius sacrificantibus desit.

. . . Sic etiam in missione vel adventu Spiritus Sancti nullus localis illius accipiendus motus, sed nostrae credendus est sanctificationis effectus.

P. L. lxv., 184, 185.

Ibid., II., 7

Cum ergo sicut diximus tota Trinitas unitate deitatis suae naturaliter immensa infinitate permaneat, et sic localiter nusquam sit, ut tamen nusquam desit, atque ita ubique tota, ut nec per partes creaturae totius particulariter dividi, nec universitate totius possit creaturae concludi, quotiens Spiritus Sanctus ad consecrandum sacrificium a Patre poscitur: prima est fidei ratio primaque cunctis christianis salubriter retentanda cautela, ut Sancti Spiritus nullatenus localis cogitetur aut existimetur adventus. P. L. lxv., 186.

Ad Monimum, II., 10

Quando autem congruentius quam ad consecrandum sacrificium corporis Christi sancta ecclesia (quae est corpus Christi) Spiritus Sancti deposcat adventum, quae ipsum caput suum secundum carnem de Spiritu Sancto noverit natum? Sic enim angelico Maria informatur eloquio: "Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te et Virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi." P. L. lxv., 188.

Frag. xxviii. ex Lib. viii. contra Fabianum

Agnosce igitur, quid in offerendis sacrificiis agitur, ut exinde intelligas, quare ibi adventus Sancti Spiritus postuletur. Nempe illud impletur in sacrificiis offerendis, quod ipsum Salvatorem nostrum praecepisse beatus testatur Apostolus dicens: "Quoniam Dominus Iesus, in qua nocte tradebatur," etc. (I Cor. xi., 23–26). Ideo igitur sacrificium offertur, ut mors Domini annuncietur, et ejus fiat commemoratio, qui pro nobis posuit animam suam. . . . Quoniam ergo Christus pro nobis charitate mortuus est, cum tempore sacrificii commemorationem mortis ejus facimus, charitatem nobis tribui per adventum Sancti Spiritus postulamus. . . . Sanctificat itaque sacrificium ecclesiae Spiritus Sanctus, et ideo in fide et charitate populus permanet christianus.

P. L. lxv., 789, 791.

Frag. xxix., *ibid.*

Sanctus itaque Spiritus, qui ecclesiae charitatem donat et servat, et sacrificium et baptisma divinae virtutis operatione sanctificat. P. L. lxv., 795.

Cæsarius of Arles. 470–542 A.D.

V. De Paschate

Recedat ergo omne infidelitatis ambiguum, quandoquidem qui auctor est muneris, ipse etiam testis veritatis. Nam invisibilis sacerdos visibiles creaturas in substantiam corporis et sanguinis sui, sui verbi secreta potestate

convertit, ita dicens: *Accipite et edite, hoc est corpus meum.* Et sanctificatione repetita: *Accipite et bibite, hic est sanguis meus.* Sicut ergo et ad nutum praecipientis Domini, repente ex nihilo substiterunt excelsa coelorum, profunda fluctuum, vasta terrarum, pari potentia in spiritualibus sacramentis verbi praecipit virtus, et rei servit effectus. Quanta itaque celebranda beneficia vis divinae benedictionis operetur, quomodo tibi novum et impossibile esse non debeat quod in Christi substantiam terrena et mortalia commutantur, teipsum qui jam in Christo es regeneratus, interroga. P. L. lxvii., 1053.

Sicut autem quicunque ad fidem veniens ante verba baptismi adhuc in vinculo est veteris debiti, his vero commemoratis mox exuitur omni faeci peccati: ita quando benedicendae verbis coelestibus creaturae sacris altaribus imponuntur, antequam invocatione sancti nominis consecrentur, substantia illic est panis et vini: post autem verba Christi corpus et sanguis Christi.

P. L. lxvii., 1056.

Fragment of Gallican Liturgy

Per Dominum nostrum, Qui pridie quam pateretur. Fiat nunc quaesumus, indulgentissime pater, per invocationem nominis tui atque infusionem Spiritus tui sancti creaturis omnibus haec creatura. . . .

Hammond, The Ancient Liturgy of Antioch, etc., pp. 53-54.

Eusebius of Alexandria. c. 560 A.D.

Πολλοὶ *πρεσβύτεροι, ἁμαρτωλοὶ ὄντες, προσφέρουσι τὰ δῶρα, καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέφεται αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός, ἀλλὰ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι ἁγιάζει καὶ μεγαλύνει.*

P. G. xcvi., 300, 301.

Eutychius of Constantinople. c. 582 A.D.

De pasch. et de ss. euch. 7

. . . *τὰ εἰσφερόμενα καὶ μηδέπω τελειωθέντα διὰ τῆς*

ἀρχιερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως καὶ τοῦ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀναλάμποντος ἁγιασμοῦ. P. G. lxxxvi., 2401.

Anastasius Sinaita. †598 or †610 A.D.

Oratio de sacra synaxi

Τί ποιεῖς, ἄνθρωπε; ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν ὑπὲρ σοῦ προσφέρει τῷ Δεσπότῃ, καὶ σὺ καταφρονεῖς; ὁ ἱερεὺς ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἀγωνίζεται· ὡς ἐν δικαστηρίῳ φοβέρῳ οὕτως τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ παριστάμενος, παρακαλεῖ καὶ ἐπισπεύδει, ἄνωθεν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματός σοι ἐπιφοιτῆσαι, καὶ σὺ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίας οὐ φροντίζεις; P. G. lxxxix., 837.

Pope Gregory I. †604 A.D.

Epistle to John of Syracuse. (Ep. ix., 12 (26))

Orationem vero Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus, quia mos apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent, et valde mihi inconveniens visum est, ut precem, quam scholasticus composuerat, super oblationem diceremus et ipsam traditionem, quem Redemptor noster composuit, super ejus corpus et sanguinem non diceremus. Sed et apud Graecos ab omni populo dicitur, apud nos vero a solo sacerdote. P. L. lxxvii., 956–957.

Dialogues, Book IV., chap. lviii.

Quis enim fidelium habere dubium possit, in ipsa immolationis hora ad sacerdotis vocem coelos aperiri, in illo Jesu Christi mysterio angelorum choros adesse, summis ima sociari, terrena coelestibus jungi, unumque ex visibilibus atque invisibilibus fieri? P. L. lxxvii., 425, 428.

Attributed to Gregory by Paul the Deacon

Praescius Conditor noster infirmitatis nostrae ea potestate, qua cuncta fecit ex nihilo, et corpus sibi ex carne semper virginis operante Sancto Spiritu fabricavit, panem

et vinum aqua mixtum, manente propria specie, in carnem et sanguinem suum ad catholicam precem ob reparationem nostram Spiritus sui sanctificatione convertit.

P. L. lxxv., 53.

John Moschus. † 620 A.D.

Pratum Spirituale, xxv.

Ὁ ἀββᾶς Γρηγόριος ὁ ἀπὸ Σχολαρίων, ἔλεγεν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἦν τις ἀδελφὸς ἐν τῷ κοινοβίῳ τοῦ Χουζιβᾶ ὃς ἦν μαθὼν τὴν προσκομιδὴν τῆς ἁγίας ἀναφορᾶς· ἐν μιᾷ οὖν ἐπέμφθη ἐνέγκαι εὐλογίας καὶ ἐρχόμενος ἐν τῷ μοναστηρίῳ εἶπεν τὴν προσκομιδὴν ὡς ἐν τάξει τῆς στιχολογίας· καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς εὐλογίας προέθηκαν ἐν τῷ δίσκῳ ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ οἱ διάκονοι· καὶ ἐν τῷ προσκομίζειν τὸν ἀββᾶν τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν τότε πρεσβύτερον ὄντα τὸ ἐπίκλην Χοζεβίτην ὃς καὶ ὕστερον γέγονεν Καισαρείας τῆς κατὰ Παλαιστίνην ἐπίσκοπος οὐκ ἐθεάσατο κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τὴν ἐπιφοίτησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ λυπηθεὶς μήτι ἄρα αὐτὸς ἥμαρτεν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπέστη τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον εἰσῆλθεν ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ κλαίων καὶ ῥίπτων ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον· καὶ φαίνεται αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου λέγων ὅτι "Ἐξότου ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπικομιζόμενος τὰς εὐλογίας ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἔλεγεν τὴν ἁγίαν ἀναφορὰν ἡγιάσθησαν καὶ τετελειωμέναι εἰσί." Καὶ ἀπὸ τότε λόγον ἔθηκεν ὁ γέρων, ὥστε μηδένα μαθεῖν τὴν ἁγίαν ἀναφοράν, μὴ ἔχοντα χειροτονίαν, μηδὲ ὡς ἔτυχεν λέγειν αὐτὴν ἐν οἱῳδήποτε καιρῷ χωρὶς τόπου ἡγιασμένου.

P. G. lxxxvii., 2869, 2872.

Ibid., cl.

. . . Ἤρξατο ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἁγίας ἀναφορᾶς, καὶ πληρώσας τὴν εὐχὴν τῆς ἁγίας προσκομιδῆς, πρὸ τοῦ τὸ συμπέρασμα ἐπιθῇ εὐχῆς, ἤρξατο ἐκ δευτέρου, καὶ πάλιν ἐκ τρίτου καὶ τετάρτου τῆς ἁγίας ἀναφορᾶς. Πάντων οὖν ξενιζομένων ἐπὶ τῇ βραδύτητι, λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ πάπας "Τί ἐστιν τοῦτο ὅτι ἰδοὺ τέταρτον τὴν ἁγίαν εὐχὴν εἶπες, καὶ οὐ

τελεῖς αὐτήν;" Τότε ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἐπίσκοπος· "Συγχώρησόν μοι, ὦ ἅγιε πάπα, ὅτι οὐκ εἶδον κατὰ τὸ σύνηθες τὴν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησιν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐτέλεσα." P. G. lxxxvii., 3016.

Isidore of Seville. † 638 A.D.

De Ecclesiasticis Officiis, Bk. I., ch. 15.

Ordo autem missae et orationum, quibus oblata Deo sacrificia consecrantur, primum a sancto Petro est institutus, cujus celebrationem uno eodemque modo universus peragit orbis.

Prima earundem oratio admonitionis est erga populum, ut excitentur ad exorandum Deum.

Secunda invocationis ad Deum est, ut clementer suscipiat preces fidelium oblationesque eorum.

Tertia autem effunditur pro offerentibus sive pro defunctis fidelibus ut per idem sacrificium veniam consequantur.

Quarta post haec infertur pro osculo pacis, ut charitate reconciliati omnes invicem digne sacramento corporis et sanguinis Christi consocientur, quia non recipit dissensionem cujusquam Christi indivisibile corpus.

Quinta deinde infertur illatio in sanctificatione oblationis, in qua etiam et ad Dei laudem terrestrium creaturarum virtutumque coelestium universitas provocatur et Hosanna in excelsis cantatur, quod Salvatore de genere David nascente salus mundo usque ad excelsa pervenerit.

Porro sexta exhinc succedit conformatio sacramenti, ut oblatio, quae Deo offertur, sanctificata per Spiritum Sanctum, Christi corpori ac sanguini conformetur.

Harum ultima est oratio, qua Dominus noster discipulos suos orare instituit dicens: Pater noster, qui es in coelis. . . . Hae sunt autem septem sacrificii orationes commendatae evangelica apostolicaque doctrina, cujus numeri ratio instituta videtur vel propter septenariam sanctae ecclesiae universitatem, vel propter septiformem

gratiae Spiritum, cujus dono ea quae inferuntur sanctificantur. P. L. lxxxiii., 752, 753.

De Ecclesiasticis Officiis, Bk. I., ch. xviii.

Haec autem [panis et vinum] dum sunt visibilia, sanctificata tamen per Spiritum Sanctum, in sacramentum divini corporis transeunt. P. L. lxxxiii., 755.

Etym. (Originum) VI., 19

Sacrificium dictum quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicae passionis, unde hoc eo jubente corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus, quod, dum sit ex fructibus terrae, sanctificatur et fit sacramentum, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei. P. L. lxxxii., 255.

Epistle VII. to Redemptus, 2

Scias itaque eorum jam dictis consuetudinibus minime nos opponere reprehensionis obstaculum, quandiu eas Romana Ecclesia dixerit tolerandas, maxime cum non sint de essentia, sive substantia sacramenti. De substantia sacramenti sunt verba Dei a sacerdote in sacro prolata ministerio, scililet, *Hoc est corpus meum*, panisque frumenti et vinum, cui consuevit aqua adhiberi, quia utrumque de latere Christi, videlicet, sanguis et aqua profluxit. P. L. lxxxiii., 905–906.

John Damascene. c. 685–765 A.D.

De Fide Orth., IV., 13

Εἰ τοινυν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ζῶν ἐστι καὶ ἐνεργής, καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἠθέλησεν ὁ Κύριος ἐποίησεν· εἰ εἶπε, γενηθήτω φῶς καὶ ἐγένετο· γενηθήτω στερέωμα καὶ ἐγένετο· εἰ τῷ λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν· εἰ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ὕδωρ τε καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀὴρ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Κυρίου συνετελέσθησαν καὶ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ πολυθρύλλητον ζῶον, ὁ ἄνθρωπος· εἰ θελήσας αὐτὸς ὁ Λόγος ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὰ τῆς ἁγίας ἀεὶ παρθένου

καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμώμητα αἵματα ἑαυτῷ ἀσπόρως σάρκα ὑπεστήσατο, οὐ δύναται τὸν ἄρτον ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ποιῆσαι; καὶ τὸν οἶνον καὶ ὕδωρ, αἷμα; εἶπεν ἐν ἀρχῇ, "ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου," καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν τοῦ ὑετοῦ γενομένου ἐξάγει τὰ ἴδια βλαστήματα, τῷ θείῳ συνελαυνομένη καὶ δυναμουμένη προστάγματι· εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, "τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα," καὶ "τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα," καὶ "τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν," καὶ τῷ παντοδυνάμῳ αὐτοῦ προστάγματι, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ, γίνεται· οὕτω γὰρ εἶπεν, "ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ." Καὶ γίνεται ὑετὸς τῇ καινῇ ταύτῃ γεωργίᾳ διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως, ἡ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπισκιάζουσα δύναμις. Ὥσπερ γὰρ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός, τῇ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐνεργείᾳ ἐποίησεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργεία τὰ ὑπὲρ φύσιν ἐργάζεται, ἃ οὐ δύναται χωρῆσαι, εἰ μὴ μόνη ἡ πίστις· "πῶς ἔσται μοι τοῦτο," φησὶν ἡ ἁγία παρθένος, "ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω;" ἀποκρίνεται Γαβριὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος. "Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεταί ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι·" καὶ νῦν ἐρωτᾷς, πῶς ὁ ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ ὁ οἶνος καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, αἷμα Χριστοῦ; λέγω σοι κἀγώ· Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπιφοιτᾷ καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῖ τὰ ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ ἔννοιαν.

. . . Σῶμά ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ἡνωμένον θεότητι, τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου σῶμα· οὐχ ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ ἀναληφθὲν σῶμα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατέρχεται, ἀλλ' ὅτι ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος μεταποιοῦνται εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Θεοῦ· εἰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς, πῶς γίνεται, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἀκοῦσαι, ὅτι διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ Κύριος σάρκα ὑπεστήσατο· καὶ πλέον οὐδὲν γινώσκομεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀληθής ἐστι, καὶ ἐνεργής, καὶ παντοδύναμος, ὁ δὲ τρόπος ἀνεξερεύνητος. Οὐ χεῖρον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, ὥσπερ φυσικῶς διὰ τῆς βρώσεως ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ διὰ τῆς πόσεως εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ ἐσθίοντος καὶ πίνοντος μεταβάλλονται, καὶ οὐ γίνονται ἕτερον σῶμα παρὰ τὸ πρότερον αὐτοῦ σῶμα· οὕτως ὁ τῆς

προθέσεως ἄρτος, οἶνός τε καὶ ὕδωρ διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὑπερφυῶς μεταποιοῦνται εἰς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλ' ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτό.

P. G. xciv., 1140, 1141, 1144, 1145.

Hom. in Sab. Sancto, 35

Καὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ πάσχα μετάσχωμεν, ἐμφορηθῶμέν τε τοῦ καινοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου γεννήματος, νῦν μὲν σάρκα Θεοῦ ἐκ σίτου καὶ αἷμα Θεοῦ ἐξ οἴνου, ἀληθῶς τῇ ἐπικλήσει καὶ ἀρρήτως μεταποιούμενον· ἀψευδὴς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος.

P. G. xcvi., 637, 640.

Peter Mansour

De corp. et sang. Christi, 4

Πῶς οὖν γέγονεν; . . . Φησὶν ὁ ἱερεύς, ὡς ὁ ἄγγελος, "ἵνα ἐπιφοιτήσαν Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἁγιάσῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ, τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἅγιον Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τίμιον Χριστοῦ." P. G. xcv., 409.

Epist. ad Zech.

Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπιφοιτᾷ, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος τῇ παρθένῳ ἐρωτησάσῃ· "Πῶς ἔσται μοι τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω;" "Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ·" οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῇ τραπέζῃ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπιφοιτᾷ, καὶ γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ. P. G. xcv., 404.

Council of Constantinople. 754 A.D.

Ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα ἅγιον, ὡς θεωθέν· οὕτως δῆλον καὶ τὸ θέσει ἤτοι ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ ἁγία, ὡς διά τινος ἁγιασμοῦ χάριτι θεουμένη. Τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἐπραγματεύσατο, ὡς ἔφημεν, ὁ Δεσπότης Χριστός, ὅπως καθάπερ τὴν σάρκα, ἣν ἀνέλαβε, τῷ οἰκείῳ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμῷ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἑνώσεως ἐθέωσεν, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἄρτον, ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα τῆς φυσικῆς σαρκός, διὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως ἁγιαζόμενον, θεῖον

σῶμα εὐδόκησε γίνεσθαι, μεσιτεύοντος τοῦ ἐν μετενέξει ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἅγιον τὴν ἀναφορὰν ποιουμένου ἱερέως.

Mansi, XIII., 264 (in Act. vi. of II. Nicæa, 787 A.D.).

Second Council of Nicæa, 787 A.D. ACT. VI.

Οὐκ οὖν σαφῶς ἀποδέδεικται, ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ οὔτε ὁ Κύριος, οὔτε οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ἢ πατέρες εἰκόνα εἶπον τὴν διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως προσφερομένην ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ σῶμα καὶ αὐτὸ αἷμα. Καὶ πρὸ μὲν τῆς ἁγιασμοῦ τελειώσεως ἀντίτυπά τισι τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων εὐσεβῶς ἔδοξεν ὀνομάζεσθαι· ὧν ἐστιν Εὐστάθιος ὁ εὐσταθὴς πρόμαχος τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πιστέως, καὶ τῆς Ἀρειάνης κακοδαιμονίας καταλύτης, καὶ Βασίλειος τῆς αὐτῆς δεισιδαιμονίας καθαιρέτης, ὁ τὴν ὑφ' ἥλιον τὴν λεῖαν βάσιν τῶν ὀρθῶς ἐκδιδάξας δογμάτων. Ἐξ ἑνὸς γὰρ καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πνεύματος φθεγγομένοι, ὁ μὲν ἑρμηνεύων τὸ ἐν ταῖς παροιμίαις Σολομώντειον ῥητόν· "φάγετε τὸν ἐμὸν ἄρτον, καὶ πίετε οἶνον ὃν κεκέρακα ὑμῖν." τάδε φησί· "διὰ τοῦ οἴνου καὶ τοῦ ἄρτου τὰ ἀντίτυπα τῶν σωματικῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ κηρύττει μελῶν." Ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς πηγῆς ἀπαντλήσας, ὡς ἴσασι πάντες οἱ τῆς ἱερωσύνης μυστηπόλοι, ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ τῆς θείας ἀναφορᾶς ὧδέ πως λέγει· "θαρροῦντες προσεγγίζομεν τῷ ἁγίῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ, καὶ προθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σοῦ, σοῦ δεόμεθα, καί σε παρακαλοῦμεν." καὶ τὸ ἑξῆς ἐπιφερόμενον ἐκδηλοτέραν τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ πατρὸς καταρτίζει, ὡς πρὸ τοῦ ἁγιασθῆναι ἐκλήθη ἀντίτυπα, μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν σῶμα κυρίως καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ λέγονται, καί εἰσι, καὶ πιστεύονται.

Mansi, XIII., 265.

Nicephorus of Constantinople. † 828 A.D.

Antirr. II. adv. Const. Copron.

Οὕτω δὴ καὶ ταῦτα ὑπερφυῶς ἐπικλήσει τοῦ ἱερεύοντος, ἐπιφοιτήσει τε τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεταβάλλεται· τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἱερέως αἴτησις ἔχει.

P. G. c., 336.

Antirr. contra Eus. 45

Ἅπερ τοίνυν καὶ ἡμεῖς νῦν προσφέρομεν κατὰ σύμβολον, τὸν ἄρτον φημὶ καὶ τὸν οἶνον, πιστεύομεν ἀκλινέστατα, καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν, ὅτι ἐπικλήσει ἱερατικῇ, ἐπιφοιτήσει τε τῇ τοῦ Παναγίου Πνεύματος, μυστικῶς καὶ ἀοράτως σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ αἷμα ἀληθῶς ἀποτελούμενα.

Pitra, Spicileg., tom. i., p. 440.

James of Edessa. 640–708 A.D.

Deinde dispensationem Domini commemorat et largitionem mysteriorum, et signat super oblationem tres cruces et tres super calicem, et quasi ex ore Domini dicit: Estote facientes memoriam meam, et respondent: memores sumus. Deinde orat super populum: deinde supplex orat, ut adveniat Spiritus Sanctus et perficiat eucharistiam; deinde commemorat illos, quos oportet.

(Angelo Mai, Script. vet. nov. collect. t. X., pars 2, p. 26.)

Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis*, etc., pp. 28–29, note 55.

Bede. † 735 A.D.

Homilies, Bk I., xiv.

Lavat itaque nos a peccatis nostris quotidie in sanguine suo, cum ejusdem beatae passionis ad altare memoria replicatur, cum panis et vini creatura in sacramentum carnis et sanguinis ejus ineffabili Spiritus sanctificatione transfertur. P. L. xciv., 75.

The Liturgy of S. Chrysostom. Ninth Century

ὁ ἱερεὺς μυστικῶς

Μετὰ τούτων καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν δυνάμεων δέσποτα φιλάνθρωπε βοῶμεν καὶ λέγομεν Ἅγιος εἶ καὶ πανάγιος καὶ ὁ μονογενής σου Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ Ἅγιον· ἅγιος εἶ καὶ πανάγιος καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὴς ἡ δόξα σου ὃς τὸν κόσμον σου οὕτως ἠγάπησας ὥστε τὸν Υἱόν σου τὸν μονογενῆ δοῦναι ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ὃς ἐλθὼν καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν οἰκονο-

μίαν πληρώσας, τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδου ἑαυτὸν λαβὼν ἄρτον ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀχράντοις καὶ ἀμωμήτοις χερσὶν εὐχαριστήσας καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις εἰπών

ἐκφω.

Λάβετε φάγετε· τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [κλώμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν].

Ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων

ἐκφω.

Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν

ὁ λαός

Ἀμήν.

ὁ ἱερεὺς μυστικῶς

Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τῆς σωτηρίου ταύτης ἐντολῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γεγενημένων, τοῦ σταυροῦ, τοῦ τάφου, τῆς τριημέρου ἀναστάσεως, τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναβάσεως, τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν καθέδρας, τῆς δευτέρας καὶ ἐνδόξου πάλιν παρουσίας

ἐκφω.

τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα

ὁ λαός

Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν σὲ εὐλογοῦμεν σοὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν Κύριε καὶ δεόμεθά σου ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν

ὁ ἱερεὺς μυστικῶς λέγει

Ἔτι προσφέρομέν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν καὶ δεόμεθα καὶ ἱκτεύομεν κατάπεμψον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ Ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα

καὶ ἀνιστάμενος σφραγίζει λέγων μυστικῶς

καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ. ἀμήν

τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ. ἀμήν

ὁ ἱερεὺς μυστικῶς

ὥστε γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς νῆψιν ψυχῆς, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος, εἰς βασιλείας πλήρωμα, εἰς παρρησίαν τὴν πρὸς σέ, μὴ εἰς κρίμα ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα.

BRIGHTMAN, Lit. E. and W., i., 321 b seq.

The Liturgy of S. Basil. Ninth Century

Κατέλιπεν δὲ ἡμῖν ὑπομνήματα τοῦ σωτηρίου αὐτοῦ πάθους ταῦτα ἃ προτεθείκαμεν κατὰ τὰς αὐτοῦ ἐντολάς· μέλλων γάρ ἐξιέναι ἐπὶ τὸν ἑκούσιον καὶ ἀοίδιμον καὶ ζωοποιὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδου ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς λαβὼν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀχράντων χειρῶν καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρί, εὐχαριστήσας εὐλογήσας ἁγιάσας κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις εἰπών

Λάβετε φάγετε· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν

Ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπελου λαβὼν κεράσας εὐχαριστήσας εὐλογήσας ἁγιάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις εἰπών

Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· ὁσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνητε τὸν ἐμὸν θάνατον καταγγέλλετε, τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάστασιν ὁμολογεῖτε.

Μεμνημένοι οὖν δέσποτα καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν σωτηρίων αὐτοῦ παθημάτων, τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ, τῆς τριημέρου ταφῆς, τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνόδου, τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν σοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθέδρας καὶ τῆς ἐνδόξου καὶ φοβερᾶς δευτέρας αὐτοῦ παρουσίας

ἐκφω.

τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα

ὁ λαός

Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν [σὲ εὐλογοῦμεν σοὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν Κύριε καὶ δεόμεθά σου ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν]

Διὰ τοῦτο δέσποτα πανάγιε καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ ἀνάξιοι δοῦλοί σου οἱ καταξιωθέντες λειτουργεῖν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐ διὰ τὰς δικαιοσύνας ἡμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἐποιήσαμέν τι ἀγαθὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ ἐλέη σου καὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμούς σου οὓς ἐξέχεας πλουσίως ἐφ' ἡμᾶς θαρροῦντες προσεγγίζομεν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστηρίῳ καὶ προθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ σὲ παρακαλοῦμεν ἅγιε ἁγίων εὐδοκίᾳ τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος ἐλθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ Πανάγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα καὶ εὐλογῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἁγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι

καὶ σφραγίζει τὰ ἅγια δῶρα γ' λέγων

τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἀμήν
τὸ δὲ ποτήριον τοῦτο αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἀμήν. τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. ἀμήν

εὐχή

ἡμᾶς δὲ πάντας τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου μετέχοντας ἑνῶσαι ἀλλήλοις εἰς ἑνὸς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου κοινωνίαν καὶ μηδένα ἡμῶν εἰς κρίμα ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα ποιῆσαι μετασχεῖν τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου ἀλλ' ἵνα εὕρωμεν ἔλεον καὶ χάριν μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνός σοι εὐαρεστησάντων τῶν προπατόρων πατέρων πατριαρχῶν προφητῶν ἀποστόλων κηρύκων εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτύρων ὁμολογητῶν διδασκάλων καὶ παντὸς πνεύματος δικαίου ἐν πίστει τετελειωμένων. BRIGHTMAN, Lit. E. and W., i., 327 a seq.

Chosroes (Andzevensis) Magnus. c. 972 A.D.

Explicatio precum missae

Et hic ait: Accepit panem: et benedixit. Et "benedicere" est: Spiritum Sanctum introducere. Qui ad Mariam missus ineffabilem in ea perfecit incarnationem et cum Verbo divino univit carnem, quae ex virgine fuit, is pariter panis cum Filio Dei uniti faciet miraculum.

P. 29 (cf. BRIGHTMAN, Lit. E. and W., p. 437, line 1).

Tunc dicit sacerdos:

"Adoramus et precamur et rogamus te, Domine, mitte super nos et oblata haec dona coaeternum tuum et consubstantialem Sanctum Spiritum,"

"Adoramus et precamur et rogamus te, Domine." Quare dicit: "te?" Hoc sibi vult: rogamus adorantes et precamur te, qui creator es et Pater, qui ab aeterno benignus et beneficus et misericors erga genus humanum fuisti, qui non solum creaturas ad necessitates nostras stabilisti, sed etiam unicum tuum et dilectum Filium dedisti nobis ut redemtorem et vicarium. Et hunc eundem in altari ponis ipsoque nos cibas. Quare infinitae beneficentiae tuae confidentes, ut Spiritum Sanctum super nos ac super sacrificium mittas, precamur, ut nos quoque Spiritus Sanctus sanctificet.

"qui pani isti benedicat et vere eum faciat corpus Domini nostri et redemtoris Jesus Christi; et calici isti benedicat et vere eum faciat sanguinem Domini nostri et redemtoris Jesu Christi,"

Incarnatus enim est redemtor ex Maria virgine, Spiritus Sanctus a Patre missus sumsit carnem ex utero Mariae et miscuit univitque cum Verbo divino, quod ab ipsa genitum ut Filius simul ac Deus manifestatum est. Idem in ecclesia et in sancto altari facit Spiritus Sanctus. Sumtum panem cum Filio Dei unit, item et calicem, ac fit corpus et sanguis Christi veraciter. — Idem hoc videmus credimusque fieri, quia infallibile est verbum Christi, qui,

quod ipse primus fecit, id usque ad adventum suum in sui memoriam fieri iussit. — Dicentes autem Spiritum Sanctum coaeternum et consubstantialem, profitemur semper apud Patrem et cum Patre ipsum fuisse. — Sicut Pater erat et est et semper est, neque ullum tempus, quo non fuerit, exstitit, ita Spiritus Sanctus semper cum Patre et cum Filio et erat et est aeternus atque consubstantialis. Qui etiam egregium tale miraculum fecit: merum panem et vinum in incorruptibilitatem corporis ac sanguinis Dei transmutans.

"ut sit accedentibus liberationi a condemnatione, expiationi, peccatorum remissioni."

In fide, ut Spiritus Sanctus super sanctum sacrificium descendat, precati secundum dominicum verbum profitemur vivificans corpus ac sanguinem, et mente haud dubitante incipimus orare. Mente scimus non dubitantes neque haesitantes super sacrum altare esse Filium Dei mortem suam, quae pro nobis evenit, perficientem testibus nobis. Ab hoc enim tempore idem, quod in cruce et in sepulcro fuit, corpus est.

Pp. 35–37 (cf. Brightman, Lit. E. and W., p. 439, lines 1–5, 10–14, 20).

Samonas of Gaza. fl. c. 1056 A.D.

Dia. cum Achmed Sar.

Τίθησι γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸν ἄρτον, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν οἶνον, καὶ, δεομένου ἐπικλήσει ἁγίᾳ, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον κάτεισι καὶ ἐπιφοιτᾷ τοῖς προκειμένοις, καὶ τῷ πυρὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον μεταβάλλει . . . Δέεται τοίνυν ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός, ὡς μέσον Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἱστάμενος πρέσβυς, ἵνα μὴ κώλυμα γένηται τῆς τοῦ Παναγίου Πνεύματος ἐπελεύσεως, ἀλλὰ καταπέμψῃ καὶ αὖθις τὸ πανταχοῦ παρὸν θεῖον καὶ τελεταρχικὸν καὶ ἁγιαστικὸν Πνεῦμα, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα τά τε ἐν οὐρανῷ, τά τε ἐπὶ γῆς λεγόμενα ἅγια, τῇ μετοχῇ τῆς ἁγιαστικῆς αὐτοῦ χάριτος

ἁγιάζεται, εἰς τὸ τελεσιουργῆσαι τὸν προκείμενον εἰς θυσίαν ἄρτον καὶ ποτήριον, καὶ ποιῆσαι αὐτά, αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο τὸ Κυριακὸν σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

P. G. cxx., 824, 825.

Theophylact. † 1107 A.D.

In Matt. xxvi. 26

"Τοῦτο ἔστιν τὸ σῶμά μου" δεικνύει ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐστὶν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἁγιαζόμενος ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, καὶ οὐχὶ ἀντίτυπον. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, "Τοῦτο ἔστιν ἀντίτυπον," ἀλλά, "Τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου·" ἀρρήτῳ γὰρ ἐνεργείᾳ μεταποιεῖται, κἂν φαίνηται ἡμῖν ἄρτος.

P. G. cxxiii., 444.

In Marc. xiv. 23

Εὐλογήσας δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐχαριστήσας, ἔκλασε τὸν ἄρτον. Ὅπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ποιοῦμεν, εὐχὰς ἐπιλέγοντες.

P. G. cxxiii., 649.

In Joan. vi. 48–52

Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, ὅτι "Ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἀντίτυπόν ἐστι τῆς σαρκός μου." ἀλλ' "ἡ σάρξ μοῦ ἐστι." Μεταποιεῖται γὰρ ἀπορρήτοις λόγοις ὁ ἄρτος οὗτος διὰ τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας, καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, εἰς σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου. P. G. cxxiii., 1308.

In 1 Cor. xiv. 16

"Ἐὰν εὐλογήσῃς τῷ πνεύματι," τουτέστι, τῷ πνευματικῷ χαρίσματι διὰ τῆς γλώσσης, "ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου," τουτέστι, ὁ λαικός, "πῶς ἐρεῖ τὸ Ἀμὴν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχῇ;" Σοῦ γὰρ εἰπόντος τὸ "εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων," ἀσαφῶς καὶ ἐν γλώσσῃ, οὐκ ἤκουσεν· ὥστε οὔτε ὠφελεῖται. P. G. cxxiv., 741.

Euthymius Zigadenus, or Zigabenus. † c. 1118 A.D.

Panoplia Dogmatica, tit. xxv. (Quoting John Damascene)

Καὶ νῦν ἐρωτᾷς πῶς ὁ ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ,

καὶ ὁ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ, αἷμα Χριστοῦ; Λέγω σοι κἀγώ· Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπιφοιτᾷ, καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῖ τὰ ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ ἔννοιαν. P. G. cxxx., 1269.

Dionysius bar Salibi. † 1171 A.D.

Abstract of Exposition of the Liturgy

Postea profert illa verba, quae Dominus noster in coenaculo dixit, cum Sacramentum perfecit: ut per haec ostendat, ipsum etiam nunc esse, qui species hasce super Altare impositas voluntate Patris et operatione Spiritus per sacerdotem, qui cruces format et verba profert, consecrat: non enim qui ministrat, sed qui super sacramenta invocatur, consecrationem efficit.

Assemani, Bibl. Orien. ii., 188.

Sacerdos inclinatus dicit invocationem Spiritus Sancti. *Miserere mei Deus Pater*, etc. Hoc loco de Spiritus Sancti invocatione inquirendum, cur hic Spiritus Sanctus super panem et vinum descendit. . . .

Ut illabens, faciat panem etc. idest, ut ille Spiritus Sanctus illabatur, quem rogavi Patrem, ut mitteret. Populus dicit, *Amen:* idest fiat, ut dixisti. Postquam autem sacerdos Spiritum Sanctum inclinatus invocavit, erigit se, inquiens: *Ut illabens* etc. et tunc Hostiam cruce signat, ter quoque calicem: ut significet, ipsum Deum Verbum ex Patris voluntate descendere, et illabi in mysteria, eaque per Spiritum Sanctum perficere: panem quidem, ut sit Corpus; mistum vero, quod in calice est, ut sanguinem faciat.

Assemani, Bibl. Orien., ii., 196, 197–198.

Germanus I. of Constantinople. † c. 740 A.D.

Rerum Eccl. Contemplatio (interpolated, twelfth or thirteenth century)

Αὐτὸς εἶπε "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τοῦτο τὸ αἷμά μου." Αὐτὸς καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐκέλευσε, καὶ δι' ἐκείνων ἁπάσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοῦτο ποιεῖν· "Τοῦτο γάρ,"

φησί, "ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν." Οὐκ ἂν ἐκέλευσε τοῦτο ποιεῖν, εἰ μὴ δύναμιν ἐνθῆναι ἔμελλεν, ὥστε δύνασθαι τοῦτο ποιεῖν. Καὶ τίς ἡ δύναμις; τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον. . . . Τοῦτο διὰ τῆς χειρὸς τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῆς γλώττης τὰ μυστήρια τελεσιουργεῖ. . . .

Εἶτα πάλιν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπαγγέλλει τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ τὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐνανθρωπήσεως μυστήρια, τὴν ἐξ ἁγίας παρθένου καὶ θεοτόκου ἀνέκφραστον γέννησιν, τὴν ἀναστροφὴν καὶ ἐμπολίτευσιν τὴν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, τὸν σταυρόν, τὸν θάνατον, τὴν ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ αὐτοῦ κατάβασιν, τὴν τῶν δεσμίων δι' αὐτοῦ ἐλευθερίαν, τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν τριήμερον καὶ ἁγίαν ἀνάστασιν, τὴν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀνάληψνί, τὴν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθέδραν, τὴν δευτέραν καὶ μέλλουσαν αὐτοῦ ἔνδοξον παρουσίαν πάλιν, τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς. . . .

Καὶ παρακαλεῖ πάλιν τελειῶσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ γεννηθῆναι, ἤτοι μεταποιηθῆναι αὐτὸν τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον, εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ. . . .

Ὅθεν καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ βουλήσει τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἀοράτως παρόν, ὑποδεικνύει τὴν θείαν ἐνεργίαν, καὶ τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ ἱερέως ἐπισφραγίζει, καὶ μεταβάλλει καὶ τελεοῖ τὰ προκείμενα ἅγια δῶρα, εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

P. G. xcviii., 433, 436, 437.

Theodore of Andida, after Germanus, perhaps twelfth or thirteenth century

Commentatio Liturgica, § 27

Καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐπαγομένην εὐχὴν ἀναδείκνυσιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ ἅγια, λέγων· "Καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτὸ τὸ τιμιον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ, τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς·" ἃ δὴ καὶ γινώσκομεν καὶ πιστεύομεν, οὕτω μεταποιεῖσθαι ὡς ἡ ἐπίκλησις ἔχει. P. G. cxl., 452, 453.

Manuel, Great Rhetor of the Great Church of Constantinople

Reply to Friar Francis (c. 1240 A.D.), § 8

Ἔτι περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ μυστικῶν λέγεις συμβόλων, τοῦ θείου καὶ Δεσποτικοῦ δηλαδὴ σώματος, ὅτι μόνα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ Κυρίου, "Λάβετε, φάγετε, καὶ πίετε," μεταβάλλουσι καὶ τελειοῦσιν αὐτά, οὐ μὴν καὶ αἱ θεῖαι τῶν ἁγίων εὐχαὶ καὶ ἱεραὶ ἐπῳδαί. Ἡμεῖς δὲ αὐτὰ τὰ θεῖα καὶ Δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα πρὸς τελείωσίν φαμεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ τῆς ἱερωσύνης δύναμις διὰ τῶν θείων εὐχῶν καὶ ἐπῳδῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τυχὸν Χρισοστόμου ἢ τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου. Τὸ γὰρ θεῖον τῆς ἱερωσύνης χάρισμα διὰ τοῦτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δέδοται τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνων ἀλληλοδιαδόχως, καὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν ἱερεῖς εἰς τὸ τελειοῦν κατὰ τὰ θεῖα δῶρα, διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ Παναγίου Πνεύματος. Οὕτως ἡμεῖς περὶ τούτων φρονοῦμεν καὶ λέγομεν ὀρθοδόξως καὶ ἀποστολικοπατροπαραδότως. P. G. cxl., 481.

Nicholas Cabasilas of Thessalonica. † 1371 A.D.

Ἑρμηνεία τῆς θείας λειτουργίας. Chap. xxvii.–xxx.

xxvii. Περὶ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ τῶν δώρων καὶ τῆς πρὸ τούτου εὐχαριστίας.

Οὕτω δὲ κάλλιστα καὶ ἱερώτατα διατεθέντα, τί λοιπόν, ἢ πρὸς εὐχαριστίαν τραπῆναι τοῦ χορηγοῦ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἁπάντων Θεοῦ; ἄλλως τε τὸν πρῶτον ἱερέα μιμούμενος εὐχαριστοῦντα τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρί, πρὸ τοῦ παραδοῦναι τὸ μυστήριον τῆς κοινωνίας, καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸ τῆς τελεστικῆς εὐχῆς, καθ' ἣν ἱερουργεῖ τὰ ἅγια, τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ταύτην ποιεῖται πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· "Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ"· καὶ πάντων συνθεμένων καὶ "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον" ἀνειπόντων, αὐτὸς ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἀναφέρει τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ δοξολογήσας αὐτὸν καὶ μετὰ ἀγγέλων ὑμνήσας καὶ χάριτας ὁμολογήσας τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἁπάντων τῶν ἐξ αἰῶνος ἡμῖν παρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων. Καὶ τελευταῖον αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρρήτου

καὶ ὑπὲρ λόγον ἡμῶν ἕνεκα τοῦ Σωτῆρος οἰκονομίας μνησθείς, εἶτα ἱερουργεῖ τὰ τίμια δῶρα, καὶ ἡ θυσία πᾶσα τελεῖται. Καὶ τίνα τρόπον; Τὸ φρικτὸν ἐκεῖνο διηγησάμενος δεῖπνον καὶ ὅπως αὐτὸ παρέδωκε πρὸ τοῦ πάθους τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ὡς ἐδέξατο ποτήριον καὶ ὡς ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἡγίασε καὶ ὡς εἶπε δι' ὧν ἐδήλωσε τὸ μυστήριον, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ῥήματα ἀνειπὼν εἶτα προσπίπτει καὶ εὔχεται καὶ ἱκετεύει, τὰς θείας ἐκείνας φωνὰς τοῦ μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐφαρμόσας καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προκειμένων δώρων, καὶ δεξάμενα τὸ Πανάγιον αὐτοῦ καὶ παντοδυνάμενον Πνεῦμα μεταβεβληθῆναι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον καὶ ἅγιον σῶμα, τὸν δὲ οἶνον εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ ἄχραντον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἅγιον αἷμα.

Τούτων δὲ εἰρημένων, τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἱερουργίας ἤνυσται καὶ τετέλεσται καὶ τὰ δῶρα ἡγιάσθη καὶ ἡ θυσία ἀπηρτίσθη καὶ τὸ μέγα θῦμα καὶ ἱερεῖον τὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου σφαγὲν ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης ὁρᾶται κείμενον. Ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ Κυριακοῦ σώματος οὐκ ἔτι τύπος οὐδὲ δῶρον, εἰκόνα φέρων τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ δώρου οὐδὲ γραφήν τινα κομίζων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τῶν σωτηρίων παθῶν ὥσπερ ἐν πίνακι, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ ἀληθινὸν δῶρον, αὐτὸ τοῦ Δεσπότου τοῦ Παναγίου σῶμα, τὸ πάντα ἀληθῶς δεξάμενον ἐκεῖνα τὰ ὀνείδη, τὰς ὕβρεις, τοὺς μώλωπας· τὸ σταυρωθέν, τὸ σφαγέν, τὸ μαρτυρῆσαν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, τὸ ῥαπισθέν, τὸ αἰκισθέν, τὸ ἐμπτύσματα ἀνασχόμενον, τὸ χολῆς γευσάμενον. Ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ οἶνος αὐτὸ τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἐκπηδῆσαν σφαττομένου τοῦ σώματος, τοῦτο τὸ σῶμα τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τὸ συστὰν ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, τὸ γεννηθὲν ἀπὸ τῆς παρθένου, τὸ ταφέν, τὸ ἀναστὰν τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, τὸ ἀνελθὸν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός.

xxviii. Πόθεν ἀσφαλῶς πιστεύομεν τὸ μυστήριον.

Καὶ τίς ἡ πίστις; Αὐτὸς εἶπε· "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά

μού, τοῦτο τὸ αἷμά μου," αὐτὸς καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐκέλευσε καὶ δι' ἐκείνων τῇ πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοῦτο ποιεῖν. "Τοῦτο γάρ," φησι, "ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν," οὐκ ἂν κελεύσας τοῦτο ποιεῖν, εἰ μὴ δύναμιν ἐνθήσειν ἔμελλε, ὥστε δύνασθαι τοῦτο ποιεῖν. Καὶ τίς ἡ δύναμις; τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ἡ ἐξ ὕψους τοὺς ἀποστόλους ὁπλίσασα δύναμις, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου· "Ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους." Τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον ἐκείνης τῆς καθόδου. Οὐ γὰρ κατελθὸν ἅπαξ, εἶτα ἀπολέλοιπεν ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστι καὶ ἔσται μέχρι πάντος. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἔπεμψεν αὐτὸ ὁ Σωτήρ, ἵνα μένῃ μεθ' ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει αὐτό, ὑμεῖς δὲ γινώσκετε αὐτό, ὅτι παρ' ὑμῖν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται. τοῦτο διὰ τῆς χειρὸς καὶ τῆς γλώσσης τῶν ἱερέων τὰ μυστήρια τελεσιουργεῖ. Καὶ οὐ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα μόνον ἔπεμψεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῖν, ὥστε μένειν μεθ' ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἐπηγγείλατο, μένειν μεθ' ἡμῶν ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος· ἀλλ' ὁ Παράκλητος ἀοράτως πρόσεστιν, ὅτι σῶμα αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐφόρεσεν, ὁ δὲ Κύριος καὶ ὁρᾶται καὶ ἁφῆς ἀνέχεται, διὰ τῶν φρικτῶν καὶ ἱερῶν μυστηρίων, ὡς ἂν τὴν ἡμετέρα φύσιν καὶ δεξάμενος καὶ φέρων εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Αὕτη τῆς ἱερωσύνης δύναμις, οὗτος ὁ ἱερεύς. Οὐ γάρ, ἅπαξ ἑαυτὸν προσαγαγὼν καὶ θύσας, ἐπαύσατο τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἀλλὰ διηνεκῆ ταύτην λειτουργεῖ τὴν λειτουργίαν ἡμῖν, καθ' ἣν καὶ Παράκλητος ἡμῖν ἐστι πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν δι' αἰῶνος, οὗ χάριν εἴρηται πρὸς αὐτόν· "Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα." Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδεμία τοῖς πιστοῖς περὶ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ τῶν δώρων ἀμφιβολία οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων τελετῶν, εἰ κατὰ τὴν πρόθεσιν καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς τῶν ἱερέων ἀποτελοῦνται. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν εἰς τοσοῦτον.

xxix. Περὶ ὧν ἡμῖν ἐνταῦθά τινες Λατῖνοι μέμφονται, καὶ πρὸς μέμψιν ἀπολογία.

Ἐνταῦθα δέ τινες Λατῖνοι τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπιλαμάβνονται. Φασὶ γάρ, μετὰ τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον, τὸ "Λάβετε, φάγετε" κ.τ.ἑ. πρὸς τὸ ἁγιασθῆναι τὰ δῶρα μηδεμιᾶς εὐχῆς ἔτι δεῖσθαι, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυριακοῦ λόγου τελούμενα. Διὰ τοῦτο οἱ μετὰ τὸ ἀνειπεῖν ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα, ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον κατονομάζοντες καὶ ὡς μήπω ἁγιασθεῖσιν εὐχόμενοι τὸν ἁγιασμόν, πρὸς τῷ ἀπιστίᾳ νοσεῖν, φασι, καὶ μάταιόν τι καὶ παρέλκον πρᾶγμα ποιοῦσιν. Ὅτι δὲ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος ὁ τὰ δῶρα τελειῶν, ὁ μακάριός, φασι, Χρυσόστομος μαρτυρεῖ λέγων, ὅτι "καθάπερ ὁ δημιουργικὸς λόγος, τὸ Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε εἴρηται μὲν ἅπαξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐνεργεῖται δὲ ἀεί, οὕτω καὶ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ἅπαξ ῥηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος, διὰ παντὸς ἐνεργεῖ." Οἱ τοίνυν τῇ ἑαυτῶν εὐχῇ θαρροῦντες μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ Κυριακῷ λόγῳ, πρῶτον μὲν ἀσθένειαν αὐτοῦ καταγινώσκουσιν, ἔπειτα ἑαυτοῖς θαρροῦντες φαίνονται μᾶλλον· καὶ τρίτον ἀμφιβόλου πράγματος τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης εὐχῆς τὸ μυστήριον ἐξαρτῶσι, πρᾶγμα τοσοῦτον, καὶ ᾧ δεῖ βεβαιότατα πιστεύειν ἀμφιβολίας μεστὸν ἀποφαίνουσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἀνάγκη τὸν εὐχόμενον καὶ εἰσακούεσθαι, κἂν ᾖ Παῦλος τὴν ἀρετήν.

Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα λύειν οὐ χαλεπόν. Καὶ πρῶτον ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν τοῦ θείου Ἰωάννου ῥήματων, οἷς διϊσχυρίζονται, ἀρκτέον. Εἰ γὰρ κατὰ τὸν δημιουργικὸν λόγον καὶ οὗτος ὁ λόγος δύναται, σκοπῶμεν ἐκεῖνο. Εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς "Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε·" τί οὖν; μετὰ τὸν λόγον ἐκεῖνον οὐδενὸς πρὸς τοῦτο δεόμεθα; καὶ χρεία ἡμῖν οὐδενὸς ἄλλου πρὸς τὴν αὔξησιν οὐδεμία; ἢ καὶ γάμου καὶ συναφείας δεῖ καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἐπιμελείας, καὶ τούτων χωρὶς οὐ δυνατὸν συνεστάναι τὸ γένος καὶ προχωρεῖν; Οὐκοῦν καθάπερ ἐκεῖ πρὸς παιδοποιΐαν ἀναγκαῖον ἡγούμεθα τὸν γάμον καὶ μετὰ τὸν γάμον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τούτου πάλιν εὐχόμεθα, καὶ οὐ δοκοῦμεν ἀτιμάζειν τὸν δημιουργικὸν λόγον, εἰδότες αἴτιον αὐτὸν τῆς γενέσεως, ἀλλὰ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον διὰ γάμου, διὰ τροφῆς, διὰ τῶν ἄλλων, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα πιστεύομεν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὸ μυστήριον τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου

λόγον, ἀλλ᾽ οὕτω διὰ ἱερέως καὶ διὰ ἐντεύξεως αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐχῆς. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ πάντων ἐνεργεῖν ἁπλῶς οὐδὲ ὅπως δήποτε, ἀλλὰ πολλὰ τὰ ζητούμενα, ὧν χωρὶς οὐ ποιήσει τὰ ἑαυτοῦ. Τὸν δὲ Χριστοῦ θάνατον τίς οὐκ οἶδεν, ὡς αὐτός ἐστι μόνος ὁ τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰσενεγκὼν εἰς τὸν κόσμον; ἀλλὰ κἀκεῖνο γινώσκομεν, ὅτι μετὰ τὸν θάνατον ἐκεῖνον καὶ πίστεως χρεία καὶ μετανοίας καὶ ἐξομολογήσεως καὶ τῆς τῶν ἱερέων εὐχῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι λυθῆναι τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἄνθρωπον, μὴ τούτων ἡγησαμένων. Τί οὖν; ἀτιμάζομεν τὸν θάνατον ἐκεῖνον καὶ ἀσθενείαν αὐτοῦ καταγινώσκομεν, ὅτι νομίζομεν, μὴ ἀρκεῖν τὰ παρ᾽ ἐκείνου, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ τὰ παρ᾽ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν εἰσενέγκωμεν; οὐδαμῶς. Οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ τοῖς εὐχομένοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ τελειωθῆναι τὰ δῶρα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐγκαλεῖν εὔλογον, ἐπεὶ οὐδέ, τῇ εὐχῇ θαρροῦντες, ἑαυτοῖς θαρροῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ δώσειν ἐπαγγειλαμένῳ Θεῷ. Τουναντίον μὲν γὰρ ὁ τῆς εὐχῆς ἀπαιτεῖ λόγος· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ τοινῦν τὴν εὐχὴν τοῖς εὐχομένοις τὸ μὴ θαρρεῖν ἑαυτοῖς περὶ τῶν ζητομένων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ μόνῳ πιστεύειν εὑρήσειν αὐτά· καὶ τοῦτο βοᾷ ὁ εὐχόμενος, δι᾽ ὧν ἑαυτὸν ἀφείς, εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καταφεύγει, ὡς τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κατέγνω δυνάμεως, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῷ Θεῷ τὸ πᾶν ἐπιτρέπει. Οὐκ ἐμόν, φησι, τοῦτο οὐδὲ τῆς ἐμῆς ἰσχύος, ἀλλά σου δεῖται καί σοι τὸ πᾶν ἀνατίθημι καὶ μάλιστ᾽ ὅτου ὑπὲρ φύσιν καὶ πάντα νικῶντα λόγον, εὐχώμεθα, οἷα τὰ τῶν μυστηρίων. Τότε γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ μόνῳ θαρρεῖν τοὺς εὐχομένους πᾶσα ἀνάγκη. Ταῦτα γὰρ οὔτε ἐνθυμηθῆναι δυνατὸν ἦν ἄνθρωπον, μὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ διδάξαντος, οὔτε ἐπιθυμῆσαι, μὴ ἐκείνου παραινέσαντος, οὔτε προσδοκῆσαι λαβεῖν, μὴ τοῦ ἀψευδοῦς τοῦτο ἐλπίσαντος· ὥστε οὐδὲ εὔξασθαι περὶ τούτων ἐτόλμησεν ἂν οὐδείς, εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ἔδειξεν ἀσφαλῶς, ὡς ἄρα αἰτεῖσθαι ταῦτα βούλεται καὶ χορηγεῖν τοῖς αἰτουμένοις ἑτοίμως ἔχει. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ ἀμφίβολος ἐνταῦθα ἡ εὐχὴ οὐδὲ τὸ πέρας ἄδηλον ἔχει αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι Κυρίου διὰ πάντων δείξαντος, ὅτι βούλεται δοῦναι. Διὰ τοῦτο τῶν μυστηρίων τὸν

ἁγιασμὸν τῇ εὐχῇ τοῦ ἱερέως πιστεύομεν, οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρωπίνῃ τινί, ἀλλ' ὡς Θεοῦ δυνάμει θαρροῦντες. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὸν εὐχόμενον ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἐπακούοντα Θεόν, οὐδ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐδεήθη, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἡ Ἀλήθεια ἐπεγγείλατο δώσειν. Ὅτι δὲ ὁ Χριστὸς ἔδειξεν, ὡς βούλεται ταύτην ἀεὶ διδόναι τὴν χάριν, οὐδὲ λόγου δεῖται. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ εἰς τὴν γὴν ἦλθε καὶ ἐτύθη καὶ ἀπέθανε, διὰ τοῦτο θυσιαστήρια καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ πᾶσα κάθαρσις καὶ πᾶσαι ἐντολαί, διδασκαλίαι καὶ παραινέσεις, ἵνα τὴν τράπεζαν παραθῇ ταύτην ἡμῖν, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ πάσχα ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἔλεγεν ἐκείνου, ὅτι τοῦτο ἔμελλε τηνικαῦτα παραδιδόναι τὸ ἀληθινὸν πάσχα τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκέλευσε "τοῦτο ποιεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν," ὅτι τοῦτο βούλεται ἱερουργεῖσθαι ἀεὶ παρ' ἡμῶν. Τίς οὖν ἔτι περὶ τοῦ ζητουμένου τοῖς εὐχομένοις ἀμφιβολογία γένοιτ' ἄν, εἰ λήψονται μέν, ὁ δέονται οὗτοι λαβεῖν, ὁ δὲ δοῦναι δυνάμενος διδόναι ἐπιθυμεῖ; Οὕτως οἱ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τῶν δώρων τῇ εὐχῇ πιστεύοντες, οὔτε τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὰς φωνὰς περιορῶσιν οὔτε ἑαυτοῖς θαρροῦσιν οὔτε ἀμφιβόλου πράγματος τὸ μυστήριον ἐξαρτῶσι τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης εὐχῆς, ὡς οἱ Λατῖνοι μάτην ἐγκαλοῦσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ πανάγιον μύρον, ὁ τῇ θείᾳ κοινωνίᾳ ὁ μακάριος Διονύσιός φησιν ὑποταγὲς εἶναι, τῇ εὐχῇ τελεῖται καὶ ἁγιάζεται, καὶ ὡς εἴη τελεστικὴ καὶ ἁγιαστική, οὐδεμία τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν ἀμφιβολία, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἱερέως χειροτονία τὸν ἴσον τρόπον καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς ἱερουργεῖται. "Εὐξώμεθα γάρ," φησιν, "ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ἔλθοι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ χάρις τοῦ Παναγίου Πνεύματος." Μετὰ τὴν ἐπίθεσιν τῆς χεῖρος ὁ χειροτονῶν πρὸς τὸν κλῆρον βοᾷ· καὶ ἡ ἐν τῇ τῶν Λατίνων δὲ ἐκκλησίᾳ τελουμένη χειροτονία τοῦ ἱερέως, μετὰ τὸ ἐπιχέαι τὸ μύρον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ χειροτονουμένου, ὁ τελῶν εὔχεται τὴν χάριν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπ' αὐτὸν κατελθεῖν πλουσίαν· καὶ ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν τοῖς μετανοοῦσι διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς τῶν ἱερέων δίδοται· καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦ ἐλαίου μυστήριον ὡσαύτως ἡ τῶν ἱερέων εὐχὴ τελεσιουργεῖ, ὁ καὶ ἴασιν

σωματικῆς νόσου καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοῖς τελουμένοις δύναται, ὡς ἡ ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις ἔχει· "Ἀσθενεῖ γάρ τις ἐν ὑμῖν," φησι, "προκαλέσασθε τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, ἀλείψαντες αὐτὸν ἐλαίῳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν καμόντα καὶ ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος, κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ." Οἱ τοίνυν τὴν εὐχὴν ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ἀποδοκιμάζοντες τί πρὸς ταῦτα ἐροῦσιν; εἰ γὰρ ἄδηλον τὸ παρὰ τῶν εὐχῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, ἄδηλον μὲν ὁ ἱερεύς, εἰ τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ὃ καλεῖται· ἄδηλον δὲ τὸ μύρον, εἰ δύναται ἁγιάζειν· καὶ οὕτως οὐδὲ τὸ μυστήριον συνεστάναι δύναται τῆς ἱερᾶς κοινωνίας, οὔτε ἱερέως ἀληθῶς ὄντος οὔτε θυσιαστηρίου. Οὔτε γὰρ παρὰ ἰδιώτου λεγόμενον τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον τελεσιουργίαν φαῖεν ἂν οὐδ' αὐτοὶ οὔτε χωρὶς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἐν ᾧ δεῖ τιθέναι τὸν ἄρτον, τῷ μύρῳ ἁγιάζεται, ὃ δὴ μύρον διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν τελεσιουργεῖται. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἄφεσιν τίς ἡμῖν δώσει βεβαίως, τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν δεήσεως ἀμφιβαλλομένων; καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο λοιπόν, ἢ πάντα τὸν Χριστιανισμὸν ἐκ μέσου ποιῆσαι ταῖς καινοτομίαις ἀκολουθοῦντας αὐτῶν. Φαίνεται τοίνυν, ὡς ἐκείνοις μᾶλλον, οἱ ταῦτα ἀξιοῦσιν, ἐν ἀμφιβολίᾳ κεῖται τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς, καὶ πολὺν ἔχει τὸ πρᾶγμα κίνδυνον, ἀλλότρια τῶν πατρικῶν παραδόσεων καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐταῖς ἀσφαλείας ἐπινοοῦσιν. Ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς εὐχόμενος ἐπινεύει καὶ δίδωσι Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ οὐδὲν ἀδυνατεῖ τοῖς μετὰ πίστεως αὐτοῦ δεομένοις, αὐτὸς εἶπεν ὁ Θεός· καὶ οὐδεμία μεχανὴ τοῦ μὴ ἀληθῆ ταῦτ' εἶναι. Ὅτι δὲ διηγουμένοις ὁτιοῦν τῶν λογίων συμβαίνει τι τοιοῦτον, οὐδαμῆ λέγεται. Καὶ τὸ μὲν εὐχῇ τὰ μυστικὰ τελεῖν οἱ πατέρες παρέδοσαν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐκείνους ἐκδεξαμένων παραλαβόντες τά τε ἄλλα, καθάπερ ἔφην, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν εὐχαριστίαν, μετὰ πολλοὺς ἄλλους καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος, οἱ μεγάλοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδά-

σκαλοι· οἷς τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας οὐδὲ λόγου τινὸς ἀξιοῦν χρὴ τοῦς εὐσεβεῖν βουλομένους. Τὸν δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων λόγον, ἐν εἴδει διηγήσεως λεγόμενον, πρὸς τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τῶν δώρων ἀρκεῖν, οὐδεὶς οὔτε τῶν ἀποστόλων οὔτε τῶν διδασκάλων εἰπὼν φαίνεται. ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν ἅπαξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου λεχθείς, αὐτῷ τῷ ὑπ' ἐκείνου λέγεσθαι, ὡς ὁ δημιουργικὸς λόγος ἀεὶ ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ ὁ μακάριός φησι Ἰωάννης· ὅτι δὲ νῦν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως λεγόμενος διὰ τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου λέγεσθαι τοῦτο δύναται, οὐδαμόθεν ἔστι μαθεῖν, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' αὐτὸς ὁ δημιουργικὸς λόγος ἐνεργεῖ, ὅτι ἐφ' ἑκάστων γενόμενος ὑπό τινος ἀνθρώπου λέγεται, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐστὶν ἅπαξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου εἰρημένος.

XXX. Ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Λατίνων ἡ τελετὴ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν τελεῖται τρόπον.

Ὁ δὲ παντελῶς αὐτοὺς ἐπιστομίζει, ὅτι καὶ ἡ Λατίνων ἐκκλησία, εἰς ἣν ἀναφέρειν δοκοῦσι, μετὰ τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν δώρων οὐ παραιτοῦνται. Λανθάνει δὲ αὐτούς, ὅτι οὐκ εὐθὺς μετὰ τὸν λόγον εὔχονται καὶ ὅτι οὐ σαφῶς ἁγιασμὸν αἰτοῦνται καὶ μεταβολὴν εἰς τὸ Κυριακὸν σῶμα, ἀλλ' ἑτέροις χρῶνται ὀνόμασι πρὸς τοῦτο φέρουσι καὶ τὰ ταῦτα δυναμένοις; Τίς δὲ εὐχή; "Κέλευσον ἀνενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιόν σου θυσιαστήριον." Λεγέτωσαν γάρ, τί ἐστιν αὐτό, τὸ ἀνενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα; ἢ γὰρ τοπικὴν μετάθεσιν αὐτοῖς εὔχονται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν κάτω τόπων εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἢ ἀξίαν τινὰ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ταπεινοτέρων ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλότερα μεταβολήν. Ἀλλ' εἰς μὲν τὸ πρότερον τί ὄφελον ταύτης ἡμῖν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἀρθῆναι τὰ ἅγια, ἃ παρ' ἡμῖν εἶναι καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν μένειν καὶ εὐχόμεθα καὶ πιστεύομεν, ὡς τοῦτο ὂν τὸ εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν μεθ' ἡμῶν ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; πῶς δὲ οὐ πιστεύουσιν, εἰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ τοῦτο γιγνώσκουσιν, ὅτι καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστι καὶ ὑπερουράνιόν ἐστι καὶ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς κάθηται; τρόπον ὅν, οἶδεν αὐτός. Πῶς δ' ἂν εἴη ὑπερουράνιον τὸ μήπω γενόμενον αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ὑπερουράνιον; πῶς

δὲ καὶ ἀνενεχθήσεται ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν καὶ πᾶν ὄνομα ὀνομαζόμενον; Εἰ δὲ ἀξίαν τινὰ αὐτοῖς εὔχονται καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον μεταβολήν, οὐκ οἶδα, εἴς τινα καταλείψουσιν ἀσεβείας ὑπερβολήν, εἴγε καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου Χριστοῦ ἀναγινώσκουσι, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον καὶ ἁγιώτερον ἠξεῖν αὐτὰ πιστεύουσιν. Ὅθεν δῆλοι πάντως εἰσίν, ἄρτον ἔτι καὶ οἶνον, μήπω δεξάμενα τὸν ἁγιασμόν, εἰδότες αὐτά· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὔχονται μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, ὡς ἔτι δεομένων εὐχῆς, εὔχονται δὲ ἀνενεχθῆναι, ὡς ἔτι κείμενα κάτω, καὶ εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ὡς μήπω τεθυμένα, ἵνα ἐκεῖ τεθέντα τυθῶσι, δεῖται γὰρ ἀγγέλου χειρός, ὡς τῆς δευτέρας ἱεραρχίας τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης κατὰ τὸν μέγαν Διονύσιον, ὑπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἱεραρχίας τῶν ἀγγέλων βοηθουμένων· αὐτὴ ἡ εὐχὴ οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστι δυναμένη τοῖς δώροις, ἢ τὴν εἰς τὸ Κυριακὸν σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταβολήν. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τόπον τινὰ ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐξῃρημένον, ἐν ᾧ δεῖ θύειν, τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐκεῖνο νομιστέον· οὕτω γὰρ οὐ πολὺ διοισόμεθα τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις λεγόντων ἢ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῆς Σαμαρείας τὸν τόπον εἶναι, ὅπου δεῖ Θεὸν προσκυνεῖν. Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ κατὰ τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον εἷς Θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, πάντα τὰ μεσιτείαν δυνάμενα, τὸν ἁγιασμὸν ἡμῖν ἔχοντα μόνος ἐστὶν αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτήρ. Τίνα δὲ τὰ μεσιτείαν συνάγοντα καὶ ἁγιάζειν δυναμένα; ἱερεύς, ἱερεῖον, θυσιαστήριον. Καὶ γὰρ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἁγιάζει κατὰ τὸν Κυρίου λόγον, τὸ θυσιασθῆναι. "Τὸ θυσιαστήριον γάρ," φησι, "τὸ ἁγιάζον τὸ δῶρον." Οὐκοῦν ἐπεὶ μόνος αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἁγιάζων, μόνος ἂν εἴη ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ἱερεῖον καὶ θυσιαστήριον· καὶ ὅτι μὲν ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ἱερεῖον, αὐτὸς εἶπεν, "Ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γάρ," φησιν, "ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν·" ὅτι δὲ καὶ θυσιαστήριον, ὁ ἱερώτατος μαρτυρεῖ Διονύσιος λέγων ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ μύρου λόγῳ· Εἰ γάρ ἐστι τὸ θειότατον ἡμῶν θυσιαστήριον ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡ θεαρχικὴ τῶν θείων νόων ἀφιέρωσις, ἐν ᾧ, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον ἀφιερούμενοι καὶ μυστικῶς ὁλοκαυτούμενοι, τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἔχομεν, ὑπερκοσμίοις ὀφθαλ-

μοῖς ἐποπτεύσωμεν τὸ θειότατον αὐτὸ θυσιαστήριον. Εἰς τοῦτο τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ὑπερουράνιον τὰ δῶρα εὔχεται ἀνενεχθῆναι ὁ ἱερεύς· ὅπερ ἐστιν ἁγιασθῆναι, εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ ὑπερουράνιον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου μεταβεβληθῆναι, οὐ τόπον ἀμείψαντα καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς γενόμενα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν· ἐπεὶ ὁρῶμεν αὐτὰ παρ' ἡμῖν ὄντα ἔτι καὶ μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν οὐδὲν ἧττον· ἐπεὶ γὰρ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἁγιάζει τὰ τεθέντα αὐτῷ δῶρα, ταὐτόν ἐστιν εὔξασθαι τοῖς δώροις ἁγιασθῆναι καὶ ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τεθῆναι. Τίς δὲ ὁ ἁγιασμός, ὃς ἁγιάζει τὸ θυσιαστήριον; τὰ τεθέντα αὐτῷ δῶρα· ᾧ αὐτὸς ὁ ἱερεὺς ἡγίασεν ἑαυτόν; τῷ προσενεχθῆναι τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τεθῆναι· ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὁ αὐτός ἐστι καὶ ἱερεὺς καὶ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἱερεῖον, ταὐτόν ἐστιν, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως ἱερουργηθῆναι καὶ εἰς τὸ ἱερεῖον ἐκεῖνο μεταβεβληθῆναι καὶ ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ἐκείνῳ τῷ ὑπερουρανίῳ ἀνατεθῆναι. Διὰ τοῦτο εἴ τι τῶν τριῶν ἀπολαβὼν εὔξαιο, τὸ πᾶν ἠύξω, τὸ ζητούμενον ἔχεις, τὴν θυσίαν ἐτέλεσας. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ παρ' ὑμῖν ἱερεῖς, ὡς ἱερεῖον τὸν Χριστὸν βλέποντες, τοῖς δώροις εὔχονται τὴν ἐν ἐκείνῳ θέσιν, ῥήμασι διαφόροις καὶ λόγοις, ἕν τε τὸ αὐτὸ πρᾶγμα εὐχόμενοι. Τούτου χάριν οἱ παρ' ἡμῖν ἱερεῖς μετὰ τὸ εὔξασθαι τοῖς δώροις τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταβολήν, μνησθέντες τοῦ ὑπερουρανίου θυσιαστηρίου, οὐκ ἔτι εἰς αὐτὸ ἀνενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἤδη ἀνενεχθέντων ἐκεῖ καὶ προσδεχθέντων εὔχονται καταπεμφθῆναι ἡμῖν τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος· "Εὐξώμεθα γάρ," φησι, "ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγιασθέντων δώρων"· ἵνα ἁγιάσθῃ; οὐδαμῶς· ἡγίασται γὰρ, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἁγιαστικὰ ἡμῖν γένωνται, ἵνα ὁ ἁγιάσας αὐτὰ Θεὸς καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτῶν ἁγιάσῃ. Φανερὸν τοίνυν, ὅτι τὸ ἀτιμάζειν τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν δώρων εὐχὴν μετὰ τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον οὐδὲ τῆς τῶν Λατίνων ἐκκλησίας ἐστὶν ἁπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἐνίων ὀλίγων καὶ νεωτέρων, οἳ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα αὐτὴν ἐλυμήναντο· εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον εὐκαιροῦντες, ἢ λέγειν τι καὶ ἀκούειν καινότερον. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς εὐχῆς.

P. G. cl., 425, 428, 429, 432, 433, 436, 437.

Ibid., ch. xxxii. Περὶ τῆς θυσίας αὐτῆς, καὶ τί ἐστι τὸ δεχόμενον τὴν θυσίαν.

. . . Ἡ θυσία οὔτε πρὸ τοῦ ἁγιασθῆναι τὸν ἄρτον, οὔτε μετὰ τὸ ἁγιασθῆναι τελεῖται, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἁγιασθῆναι. P. G. cl., 440.

Ibid., ch. xxxi.

Τίνος χάριν ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τῶν δώρων, οὐ τὸν Υἱόν, ἀλλὰ τὸν Πατέρα καλεῖ;

Ἀλλὰ τίνος χάριν οὐ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἁγιάσαι τὰ δῶρα ὁ ἱερεὺς καλεῖ, ἱερέα ὄντα καὶ ἁγιάζοντα, καθάπερ εἴρηται, ἀλλὰ τὸν Πατέρα; Ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι τὸ ἁγιάζειν ὁ Σωτήρ, οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔχει, ἀλλ' ὡς Θεός· καὶ διὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν θείαν ἣν κοινὴν κέκτηται μετὰ τοῦ Πατρός.

Τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος δηλῶσαι βουλόμενος, ὅτε ἐτέλει τὸ μυστήριον, εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔβλεπε, καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ ἀνεδείκνυε τὸν ἄρτον. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἕνια τῶν θαυμάτων οὕτω φαίνεται ποιῶν, ἐν σχήματι τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐχῆς, ἵνα δείξῃ ὡς οὐ φύσεως ἀνθρωπίνης ἐστὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, καθ' ἣν μητέρα ἔσχεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀλλὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ θειότητος, καθ' ἣν τὸν Θεὸν ἔσχε Πατέρα. P. G. cl., 437.

Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica. † 1429 A.D.

Ἑρμηνεία περί τε τοῦ θείου ναοῦ . . . οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας κ.τ.λ.

§ 86. . . . Εἶτα τὸ μέγιστον πάντων τῶν ἔργων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνυμνήσας ὁ ἱεράρχης τὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἐνανθρώπησιν, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον πάλιν ἔργον τῆς οἰκονομίας αὐτοῦ τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν θάνατον εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν τῶν μυστηρίων χωρεῖ τε τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀνακράζει λόγους, οὓς εἶπεν αὐτὸς ἱερουργῶν ὁ Σωτήρ· "Λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου" καὶ "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου·" καὶ τὸ ἐφεξῆς. Ἔπειτα ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐχαριστήσας, καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τὰ δῶρα προσάγων, τὴν θείαν ἐπικαλεῖται εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ εἰς τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα χάριν τοῦ Πνεύματος· δι' ἧς καὶ ταῦτα τετελεκὼς σφραγῖδι σταυροῦ

καὶ ἐπικλήσει τοῦ Πνεύματος, τὸν ζῶντα εὐθὺς βλέπει προκείμενον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ τοῦτον αὐτὸν ἀληθῶς ὄντα τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον. Αὐτοῦ γὰρ αὐτό, ὁ ἄρτος τὸ σῶμα· καὶ τούτου αὐτό, τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ αἷμα.

P. G. clv., 732, 733.

§ 88. Ἀπάντησις κατὰ τῶν βλασφήμως λεγόντων, πῶς τῇ εὐχῇ πιστεύομεν τελειοῦσθαι τὰ θεῖα δῶρα.

Ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα τῶν μὴ ὀρθῶς φρονούντων τινές, ἐν τῇ ἐπικλήσει τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ τῇ τελειώσει τῶν δώρων οἷον διαποροῦντες, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνθιστάμενοι τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ὑπό τε τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ, ἔτι τε καὶ τῶν διαδόχων τούτων θεοφόρων πατέρων, φιλονεικοῦσι, λέγοντες, πῶς οὐκ ἀρκούμεθα τοῖς Κυριακοῖς μόνοις ῥήμασιν ἐπὶ τῇ τελειώσει τῶν θείων δώρων, ἀλλὰ τῇ εὐχῇ θαρροῦμεν ἡμῶν; Οὗτοι οὖν τήν τε ἐπίκλησιν ἀθετοῦσι τολμηρῶς καὶ βλασφήμως τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος, καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπαρνοῦνται (φεῦ!) δύναμίν τε καὶ ἐνέργειαν, ἣν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ καὶ ἐπηγγείλατο δοῦναι, καὶ ἐδωρήσατο, δι' ἧς καὶ ἱερουργοὶ οὗτοι ποιμένες κεχειροτόνηνται, ἐπελθόντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παναγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ ταῖς πυρίναις γλώσσαις τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐνθεμένου ἐν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν, δι' ἧς καὶ τὴν ἱερουργίαν, καὶ τὰς χειροτονίας διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν, καὶ τὰ ἰάματα καὶ θαυμάσια ἐξετέλουν. Καὶ γὰρ οὐ τὸ ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν "Ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου," καὶ τὰ λοιπά, τὸ δύνασθαι ἔχει μόνον καθ' αὑτό· ἀλλὰ τὸ μετὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τὸν ἱερέα εἰπεῖν, τουτέστι μετὰ τοῦ χαρίσματος, μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως δηλαδὴ τῆς ἱεροσύνης. Καὶ δῆλον ἐκ τούτου· εἰ γὰρ μυριάκις εἶποιεν τὰς Δεσποτικὰς φωνὰς καὶ πᾶσαν θείαν ἐπίκλησιν, εἴτε βασιλεῖς πάντες ἢ ἀσκηταί, εἴτε πάντες εὐλαβεῖς, μὴ ἱερωσύνην ἔχοντες, εἴτε ἅπαντες ὁμοῦ οἱ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ γῇ πιστοί, οὐδὲν πλέον ἔσται, μὴ ἱερέως παρόντος, καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἱερουργημένα ἔσται τὰ παρ' ἐκείνων προτεθέντα, οὐδὲ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ· ὥστε οὐκ ἄνθρωπος,

ἀλλὰ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως ἐνεργῶν, ἐπικαλουμένου τὴν χάριν τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ ὅπερ ἂν εἴπῃ ὁ ἱερεύς, ἐνεργόν ἐστι τῇ τῆς ἱερωσύνης δυνάμει. Αὕτη δὲ Θεοῦ ἐστι δύναμις, ἣν οὐ πᾶς κέκτηται πιστός, ἀλλ' ὁ τὴν χειροτονίαν τοῦ ἱερέως μόνος δεξάμενος, καὶ πᾶσα εὐχὴ αὐτοῦ τελειοποιὸς θείᾳ χάριτι. Καὶ ὁ μὴ τοῦτο πιστεύων οὐδὲ δεχόμενος οὔτε βάπτισμα ἄρα, οὔτε μύρων τελετήν, οὔτε χειροτονίαν ἱερατικῶν τάξεων, οὔτε λύσιν ἐγκλημάτων, οὔτε μὴν σχήματος μοναχοῦ ἱερὰν εὐχὴν παραδέχεται, καὶ ἀπίστου οὗτος ἐγγύς, καὶ ἑαυτὸν τῆς μοίρας ἐξάγει τῶν Χριστιανῶν. Πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα δι' εὐχῶν τελεῖται τῶν ἱερατικῶν. Ὥσπερ οὖν βαπτίζοντες καθὰ παρελάβομεν, εἰς ὄνομα βαπτίζομεν Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τῇ ἐπικλήσει τῆς Τριάδος τὸν βαπτιζόμενον τελειοῦντες, καίτοι γε οὐδὲ ταύτῃ τῇ ἐπικλήσει μόνῃ ἀρκούμεθα, ἣν παρέδωκεν ὁ Σωτήρ, ἀλλὰ πρότερον μὲν καὶ σφραγῖδι, καὶ ἐμφυσήματι, καὶ ἀποταγαῖς, καὶ συνταγαῖς καὶ εὐχαῖς, καὶ χρίσει ἐλαίου ἁγιαζομένου σφραγῖδι, καὶ ἐμφυσήματι, καὶ ἐπικλήσει τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος, τὸν βαπτιζόμενον προκαθαίρομεν, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ βαπτίσματος σφραγῖδι καὶ ἐπικλήσει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καθαγιάζομεν, καὶ τὸ μύρον δὲ τὸ ἱερὸν ὁμοίως εὐχαῖς τελειοποιοῦμεν ἀρχιερατικαῖς, καὶ σφραγῖδι τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα τὸν βαπτισθέντα καὶ χρισθέντα τῷ μύρῳ εὐχαῖς τελειοῦμεν ἱεραῖς, καὶ τοῖς Θεοφανίοις ἁγιαζόμενα ὕδατα εὐχαῖς ἁγιάζομεν, καὶ ἔτι τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην ἁγιαζόμενα, τῶν ἱερέων τὴν ἰσχὺν κεκτημένων ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἐν ὕδατι, ὅτε τὸ Πνεῦμα κατῆλθε, καὶ τὸν χειροτονηθέντα ἀρχιερέα ἢ ἱερέα δεχόμεθα ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερατικῶν εὐχῶν καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπικλήσεως, ἅπερ πλουτοῦσι τὴν δύναμιν ἀπὸ τῆς εἴδει πυρίνων γλωσσῶν, ὡς εἰρήκαμεν, ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐλθούσης τοῦ Παρακλήτου δωρεᾶς τε καὶ χάριτος, οὕτω καὶ τὸ γενέσθαι τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερατικῶν πιστεύομεν σαφῶς ἐνερεῖσθαι εὐχῶν, καὶ τελειοῦσθαι τῇ τοῦ σταυροῦ σφραγῖδι, καὶ τῇ ἐπικλήσει τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος,

τῶν Κυριακῶν φωνῶν, τὸ "Λάβετε, φάγετε," καὶ "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες," καί, "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν," τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς τῆς χάριτος αὐτῶν διδόχοις ἅπαξ τοῦτο παρασχουσῶν, δύνασθαι διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν ἐνεργεῖν. Διὸ καὶ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἐκδιηγούμενος, καὶ ἀνυμνῶν τὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας ὁ ἱερεύς, πρῶτον μὲν τὰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ θείας ἀνακράζει φωνάς, καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο αὐτὸς παρέδωκε, καὶ ὅτι "Διὰ τοῦτο προσφέρομέν σοι ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐντολήν, λοιπὸν δεόμεθά σου, σὺ τὸ Πνεῦμά σου ἐξαπόστειλον εἰς ἐμέ τε καὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα. Καὶ ποίησον ταῦτα σῶμα καὶ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἔφη, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Ἁγίῳ σου Πνεύματι." Καὶ ἐν τῷ λέγειν, σφραγίζει· καὶ τρὶς σφραγίσας, αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα πιστεύει εἶναι ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτός ἐστι Χριστὸς ὁ διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως ἐνεργῶν ἅμα τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι, καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος, καὶ ἱερουργῶν καὶ ἱερουργούμενος, καὶ προσδεχόμενος, καὶ διαδιδόμενος, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ τῆς μεγάλης εἰσόδου τοῦτο λέγομεν ἱερωτάτῃ εὐχῇ. Καὶ ἵνα σαφέστερον τοῦτο παραδηλώσωμεν, οὐδὲ σφραγίζει τὰ δῶρα ὁ ἱερεύς, ἐν τῷ λέγειν, "Λάβετε, φάγετε," καὶ "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες," διηγούμενος γὰρ ὡς ἔφημεν, ταύτας λέγει πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα τὰς φωνάς, ἐπεὶ καὶ μετὰ ταύτας ἀντίτυπα τὰ δῶρα φησὶν ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος. Ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ προσαγαγεῖν τὰ δῶρα, καὶ εἰπεῖν, "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν," καὶ ἐπικαλέσασθαι τὴν χάριν τοῦ Πνεύματος, τότε γὰρ πιστεύει παρεῖναι ταύτην διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς εὐχῆς, ἀναστὰς σφραγίζει τὰ θεῖα δῶρα, καὶ εἰρηκὼς καὶ "Ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου·" καὶ σφραγίσας, τρίτον δὲ καὶ ἀμφότερα σφραγίσας, καὶ ἀνειπών, "Μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ," τὸ Ἀμὴν ἐπιλέγει, βεβαιῶν τὸ μυστήριον, καὶ θαρρούντως ὁμολογῶν, ὡς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τὰ προκείμενά εἰσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῇ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει καὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπινον ἐκεῖσε, ἀλλὰ πάντα θείᾳ γίνεται χάριτι. Διὸ καὶ ὁ προσάγων κεχειροτονημένος, καὶ

τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐφ' ᾧ τὰ δῶρα, ἡγιασμένον, καὶ χωρὶς τούτων, τελεῖται οὐδέν. Θεμέλιος μὲν οὖν ἐστι τῆς ἱερουργίας τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὡς ἔφημεν, ῥήματα ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἐνεργεῖ δὲ διὰ τῶν τοῦ ἱερέως εὐχῶν. Ὥστε οὐκ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν, καθὸ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἱερεύς, ἀλλ' ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, διὰ τῆς ἱερωσύνης τῶν ἱερέων. Καὶ ὥσπερ ἅπαξ ἔφη Θεός, "Βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ," καὶ ἐνεργόν ἐστι τὸ ῥῆμα καὶ ἀεὶ βλαστάνει ἡ γῆ, καὶ "Γενηθήτω φῶς," καὶ ἀεὶ φαίνει τὸ φῶς, οὕτω, "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε," εἰπών, "εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν," ἀεὶ ἐνεργεῖ διὰ τῶν ἱερέων αὐτοῦ τὸ ῥῆμα. Διὸ καὶ τό, "Ποίησον τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ," ἐνεργὸν διὰ τῶν ἱερέων ἐστί, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἀλήθεια καὶ οὐ τύπος, σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ τὰ ἱερουργούμενά εἰσιν, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν, ὡς προείρηται, ὁ διὰ τῶν ἱερέων ἐνεργῶν. Καὶ τοῦτο οὕτως αὐτὸς παρέδωκε γίνεσθαι, τὸ διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν ἱερουργεῖν. Ἔλαβε γὰρ τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνέβλεφε, καθὰ γέγραπται, καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ εὐχαριστήσας, ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς, λέγων, "Λάβετε, φάγετε." καὶ "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ," καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὁμοίως, ὥστε καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτὰ διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν ἱερούργησεν οὐ χρείαν ἔχων εὐχῶν, Θεὸς ὢν παντοδύναμος, ἀλλ' ἐκ τούτου δεικνύς, ὅτι μία δύναμις τῆς Τριάδος, καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν αὐτουργεῖν, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα συνευδοκούντα ἔχει, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον συνεργόν, καθὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ θείᾳ σαρκώσει γέγονεν. Αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἦν μόνος ὁ Μονογενὴς σαρκωθείς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ εὐδόκησε, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα δὲ τῇ σαρκώσει συνήργησεν, ὡς καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὴν παρθένον διδάσκει τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου φωνή, ἐπεὶ καὶ μία ἡ τῆς Τριάδος δύναμις καὶ ἐνέργεια, καὶ οὐδὲν ὅπερ ὁ Υἱὸς σαρκωθεὶς ἐκτετέλεκεν, εἰς ὃ μὴ καὶ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Πατήρ, ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον μὴ συνήργησεν. Οὐκοῦν ὁ τὰς ἱερατικὰς εὐχὰς ἀθετῶν ἐπὶ τῇ τελειώσει τῶν μυστηρίων οὐδ' ἄλλην ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἁπασῶν τελετῶν τελεστικὴν εὐχὴν δέχεται, καὶ οὐ Χριστιανὸς οὗτος, ἐπεὶ οὔτε βάπτισμα, ὡς προειρήκαμεν, οὔτε χρίσμα, οὔτε μετάνοιαν, οὔτ' ἔλαιον ἅγιον, οὔθ' ἁμαρτιῶν ἄφεσιν, ἢ θείαν

ἱερωσύνην, ἢ μοναδικὸν σχῆμα, ἢ ναὸν ἅγιον, ἢ τίμιον γάμον, ἤ τινα ὅλως ἁγιασμὸν παραδέχεται. Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα διὰ τῶν ἱερατικῶν εὐχῶν ἐνεργεῖται. Ἡ τοίνυν μηδόλως εὐχὴν ἐν τῇ ἱερουργίᾳ ἢ προλεγέτω ἢ ἐπιλεγέτω, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲ τὴν χάριν ἐπικαλείσθω τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὡς ἂν μηδὲ κοινωνίαν ἔχῃ Χριστοῦ, ὁμοίως τε μήτ' ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι ἢ ταῖς ἄλλαις τελεταῖς ἐπικαλείσθω τὴν χάριν τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἵνα μηδαμῶς ἔχῃ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μυστήριον, μηδ' ὅλως εἴη Χριστιανός, ἢ Χριστιανὸς λέγων εἶναι, καὶ δεχόμενος τὰς τῶν ἱερέων εὐχάς, καὶ τὰς τελεστικὰς ταύτας φωνὰς δεχέσθω, πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα τε οὔσας καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπικλήσει γινομένας τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος, ὡς παραδέδωκεν ὁ Σωτὴρ πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα εὐχαριστήσας, ὡς εἴρηται, ἐν τῷ τὰ μυστήρια ἐνεργεῖν. Ὃ καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ποιοῦντες ἐδείκνυντο, εὐχαριστοῦντες ἅμα καὶ κλῶντες τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ οἱ πατέρες παραδεδώκασι Βασίλειος καὶ Χρυσόστομος. Οἱ ἀνθιστάμενοι δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς σφῶν λειτουργίας ἐξελεγχέσθωσαν. Εὔχονται γὰρ καὶ αὐτοί, τὰ προκείμενα σῶμα γενέσθαι καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ εὐλογοῦσι τὰ δῶρα, καὶ ἐμφυσῶσι παρὰ τὴν θείαν παράδοσιν, οὐκ ἀρκούμενοι ταῖς τοῦ Κυρίου μόνον φωναῖς. Ἀλλ' οὗτοι μὲν πάντα καινοτομείτωσαν. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τηροῦντες τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς παρελάβομεν, ὡς ὁ Σωτὴρ δι' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων παρέδωκε καὶ πατέρων, τά τε μυστήρια τῆς φρικτῆς ἐκτελῶμεν κοινωνίας, τῇ ἐπικλήσει τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος,—διά τε τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου ῥημάτων, καὶ τῶν ἱερατικῶν εὐχῶν, καὶ πάσας τὰς θείας τελετάς—, τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ ἱερέως ἐν θείᾳ ἐπικλήσει, καὶ τῇ τοῦ σταυροῦ σφραγῖδι, τὴν τελείωσιν πιστεύωμεν δέχεσθαι κατὰ τὴν θείαν παράδοσιν. Ἀλλὰ τὸ περὶ τούτου μὲν ἀρκείτω. P. G. clv., 733, 736, 737, 740.

Answer of the Four Prelates, Trebizond, Mitylene, Nicæa, and Kieff, 8 June, 1439

Περὶ δὲ τῆς θείας ἱερουργίας ἐζητήθη πρὸς τῶν Λατίνων· πῶς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ῥημάτων λαληθέντων, τοῦ, "Λάβετε,

φάγετε, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·" καὶ τοῦ, "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς καὶ αἰωνίου διαθήκης, μυστήριον πίστεως, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·" καὶ τῶν ἁγίων δώρων διὰ τούτων τῶν ῥημάτων τελειωθέντων, ὑμεῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ποιεῖτε εὐχήν, καὶ λέγετε· "Καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ, τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ." Ἐλύθη καὶ τοῦτο οὕτως· ἡμεῖς εἴπομεν, ὅτι ὁμολογοῦμεν διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων τελειοῦσθαι τὸν θεῖον ἄρτον, καὶ γίνεσθαι σῶμα Χριστοῦ· ἀλλ' ὕστερον, καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ λέγετε· "Κελευσον προσενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα διὰ χειρὸς ἁγίου ἀγγέλου εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιόν σου θυσιαστήριον," οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχόμεθα, λέγοντες· "Κατελθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ποίησον ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ, τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστου σου, καὶ μεταβαλεῖν αὐτὰ τῷ Πνεύματι αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἁγίῳ, ὥστε γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς νίψιν ψυχῆς, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· μὴ γένωνται εἰς κρῖμα ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα ἡμῶν." Mansi, XXXI A, cols. 1004, 1005.

Reply made on 10 June, 1439

Τὸ τῶν μυστηρίων, ὁμολογοῦμεν ὅτι τελειοῦνται διὰ τῶν Κυριακῶν φωνῶν, εἰ καὶ ὕστερον ἡμεῖς ἐπικαλούμεθα· Γινέσθω σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ.

Mansi, XXXI A, cols. 1012.

The Decree of Union, 5 July, 1439 (so far as concerns the Eucharist)

Ἔτι ἐν ἀζύμῳ ἢ ἐν ἐνζύμῳ ἄρτῳ σιτίνῳ τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα τελεῖσθαι ἀληθῶς, τούς τε ἱερεῖς ἐν θατέρῳ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου ὀφείλειν τελεῖν, ἕκαστον δηλονότι κατὰ τὴν τῆς ἰδίας ἐκκλησίας, εἴτε δυτικῆς, εἴτε ἀνατολικῆς, συνήθειαν. Mansi, XXXI A, col. 1029.

Query of the Latins after the Subscription of the Decree of Union

Μετὰ ταῦτα ζητοῦσιν οἱ Λατῖνοι ἀφ' ἡμῶν ζητήματα ταῦτα. . . . Καὶ διὰ τί οὐκ ἀρκεῖσθε, φησίν, εἰς τὰ Κυριακὰ λόγια τό, "Λάβετε, φάγετε·" ἀλλὰ λέγετε μετὰ ταῦτα· "Καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου," καὶ "Μεταβαλὼν· αὐτὰ τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ, Ἀμήν, Ἀμήν, Ἀμήν."

Mansi, XXXI A, cols. 1040, 1041.

Isidore of Kieff at the Council of Florence, 20 June, 1439

Si putarem aliquam contrarietatem inter ea, quae dicta sunt per magistrum, facerem longum sermonem. Nam necesse est in contradictionibus aut confirmare aut confutare. Sed quoniam puto, [nos] adjutorio Dei esse concordes, per tria, quae dicam, breviter me expedio.

Et primo dico ex tempore. Hoc missale, quo utimur, est traditum a Basilio et beato Chrysostomo; utebamur autem ante tempus schismatis, nec aliqua facta est mutatio. Tamen occidentalis ecclesia nunquam de hoc verbum fecit: videlicet cum fuerimus concordes et ad eundem finem tendentes, secundum rem dicimus idem. Et dico: quod credimus, id quod conficit mysterium, esse sermonem Domini, et credimus, Dominicam vocem esse effectricem divinorum munerum; et illa vox semper replicatur a sacerdote, et suscipit sacerdos, quod vox illa replicata aptetur et sit eadem vox cum voce Domini. Et ut ita aptetur, invocatur Spiritus Sanctus et supplicat sacerdos, ut per virtutem Spiritus Sancti concedatur gratia, ut vox repetita efficiatur ita effectiva, ut verbum Dei fuit. Et ita credimus, consummativam fieri per illam orationem sacerdotis. Et probo, quod Dominicae voces habent operationem, ut semina, quia sine semine non potest effici fructus: ita in hac Dominica voce. Tamen ubi cadit semen, eget aliis instrumentis, ut sacerdotis,

altaris et orationum. Unde credimus, per hoc [nos] vobiscum esse concordes.

Quod autem addatur in definitione, dixit paternitas vestra, quod est necesse propter discordiam. Et dico, quod esset, si haec difficultas esset contraria; sed non est mota, ut fuerint disputationes, et ideo, cum non fuerit controversia, non debet deduci in dubium.

De illa particula, in qua considerantur quatuor ad confectionem sacramenti, nos idem sentimus, quod vos: quod requiritur panis tritici et vinum de vite et sacerdos et principaliter per verba Dominica. Et quoniam in omnibus his sumus concordes, vos dicitis, quod debet poni propter declarationem rudium. Rudes ita clare tenuerunt et ita tenebunt: unde non est necessarium hoc poni in diffinitione. Nam multae quaestiones sunt in baptismate; si de omnibus vellemus providere tempus non sufficeret. Cum autem dixerim ex me, suppliço sanctissimum dominum nostrum et reverendos patres, ut non exigant aliam definitionem. Mansi, XXXI B, col. 1686–1687.

Vera Historia Unionis non Verae inter Graecos et Latinos: sive **Concilii Florentini Exactissima Narratio**, Graece scripta per **Sylvestrum Sguropulum**. . . . Transtulit in Sermonem Latinum, Notasque ad Calcem Libri adjecit . . . Robertus Creyghton, S. Th. Doctor, et S. Burianae Decanus. Hagae-Comitis. 1660.

§ X. Ἐν ᾧ περὶ τῆς τελειώσεως τῶν θείων μυστηρίων, κτλ.

Chap. I. . . . Τὸ δὲ περὶ τοῦ ἐνζύμῳ καὶ ἀζύμῳ ἵνα ἑκάστη δηλαδὴ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν καὶ δυτικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν συνήθειαν, ἡ μὲν ἱερουργῇ τὸ ἄζυμον, ἡ δὲ τὸ ἔνζυμον. . . .

Εἶτα ἐζήτησαν διορθῶσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀργῆσαι τὴν ἐπί τῇ τελειώσει τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας τριτὴν εὐλογίαν, καὶ ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὴν γενομένην παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως. Ἔφασκον γὰρ ὅτι αἱ Δεσποτικαὶ φωναὶ ἁγιάζουσι

ταύτας ἤγουν τὸ "Λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου," καὶ τὸ "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες." Διὸ καὶ ἐμέμφοντο οἱ Λατῖνοι τοὺς ἡμετέρους, ὡς ἐσφαλμένως ποιοῦντας, μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ταῦτα ῥήματα ἐπευχομένους, καὶ εὐλογοῦντας τὰ ἅγια. Καὶ ἐζήτουν ἵνα κωλύσωσι τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἱερεῖς τοῦ ἐπεύχεσθαι καὶ εὐλογεῖν μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ταῦτα ῥήματα. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἔνστασις καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Βασιλέως, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Λατίνων μεγάλη ἐν πολλαῖς συνελεύσεσιν. Ὅ τε Βασιλεὺς μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν λόγων ἔφη καὶ τοῦτο, "Ὅτι εἰ θέλετε πιστωθῆναι πῶς καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος, καὶ ὁ μέγας Χρυσόστομος οὕτω παρέδωκαν ἁγιάζειν τὰ θεῖα δῶρα, καὶ τελειοῦν, εὑρήσετε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ ἐκκλησίαις τὰς γεγραμμένας λειτουργίας πάσας οὕτω διαλαμβανούσας ὑπὲρ τὰς χβ οὔσας." Ἔφη δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο ὁ Ἰουλιανός, "Δύναται ἡ ἁγία Βασιλεία σου μεθ' ὅρκου διαβεβαιῶσαι, ὅτι τὰ βιβλία ἅπερ ὁρίζεις, οὕτως ἐξεδόθησαν τὴν ἀρχὴν παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων, καθὼς εὑρίσκοντο νῦν, καὶ οὐδ' ὅλως μετεποιήθησαν ἐν τούτοις χρόνοις; Εἰ δὲ τοῦτο οὐ γενήσετο, πῶς ἡμεῖς τοῖς βιβλίοις πιστεύσομεν;"

Ὡς οὖν καὶ εἰς τοῦτο παράτασις ἡμερῶν ἐγένετο, διεμηνύσατο ὁ πάπας καὶ ἐγένετο συνέλευσις τοῦ Βασιλέως καὶ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν πάπαν, μόνου τοῦ Ἐφέσου ἀπόντος. Καὶ λόγοι πολλοὶ περὶ τοῦ δὲ κεκίνηνται τοῦ ζητήματος· τῶν μὲν Λατίνων ἀγωνιζομένων παντὶ τρόπῳ συστῆσαι ἣν ἔχουσι δόξαν περὶ τούτου, καὶ καταστῆσαι καὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους οὕτως ἱερουργεῖν, τοῦ Ῥωσίας δὲ καὶ τοῦ Νικαίας ἀντιλεγόντων μὲν ἐκ μέρους, κατά τι δὲ καὶ συμφωνούντων. Ἔφασκον γὰρ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τοῦτο· "Ὅτι καθάπερ τὸ θεῖον ἐκεῖνο πρόσταγμα ἅπαξ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰρημένον, τό, 'Βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου, σπεῖρον σπέρμα κατὰ γένος' ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ εἰς δεῦρο ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ ἕως τῆς συντελείας δὲ ἐνεργήσει· καὶ πεπείσμεθα μὲν ὡς τὸ θεῖον πρόσταγμά ἔστι τὸ ἐμποιοῦν τῇ γῇ δύναμιν ἀναφύειν καὶ

καρποφορεῖν, χρεία δὲ ὅμως καὶ ἐνεργείας γεωργικῆς, ὁρῶμεν γὰρ αὐτὴν πλεῖστα συνεργοῦσαν τῇ γῇ πρὸς καρποφοράν. Οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης θυσίας φαμὲν ὅτι τὰ μὲν ἐκεῖνα ῥήματα, εἰσὶ τὰ ἁγιάζοντα ταύτην, συμβάλλοντο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ αἱ εὐχαί, καὶ αἱ ἐπικλήσεις τοῦ ἱερέως πρὸς τὴν τελείωσιν, ὥσπερ ἡ ἐπιμέλεια τοῦ γεωργοῦ πρὸς τὴν φορὰν τῆς γῆς." Ταῦτα εἰπόντων οὔθ' οἱ ἡμετέροι πάντες ἠρκέσθησαν, πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν ἀφορῶντες τῶν ἐν ταῖς θείαις λειτουργίαις γεγραμμένων, οὔτε πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ Λατῖνοι πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ἀφορῶντες πρόληψιν. Διὸ καὶ οὐ συνεφώνησαν. Pp. 277, 278–279.

Ibid.

§ X., Chap. VIII. . . . Ὥρισεν ὁ Βασιλεύς, "Ὅτι ὁ Νικαίας ἐστὶν ἀνατεθειμένος, ἵνα εἴπῃ λόγους τινὰς πρὸς τὸν πάπαν οὓς ἀκούσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐκεῖσε."

Ἀπήλθομεν οὖν μὴ εἰδότος τινὸς τῶν σταλέντων τι ὁ Νικαίας ἐρεῖ. Καὶ εὕρομεν τὸν πάπαν καθήμενον μετὰ τῶν καρδηναλίων, καὶ πάσης τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν συνόδου· ἐκαθίσαμεν δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς. Καὶ ἀρξαμένου τοῦ Νικαίας λέγειν εὐθὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰουλιανός, "Πρωτονοτάριε σκρίβα." Ἐκάθισεν οὖν ὁ πρωτονοτάριος, καὶ ἕτεροι γραμματικοί, καὶ ἔγραφον ἐπιμελῶς ὅσα εἶπεν ὁ Νικαίας. Ὃς καὶ βραχέα τινὰ προοιμιασάμενος εἰς τὸ περὶ τῆς τελειώσεως, τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ μυστικῆς θυσίας τὸν λόγον κατέληξε εἰπών, "Ὅπερ δοξάζει ἡ ἁγία Ῥωμαικὴ ἐκκλησία περὶ τῆς τελειώσεως τῶν θείων δώρων τοῦτο δοξάζομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς· ὅτι αἱ θεῖαι καὶ Δεσποτικαὶ φωναὶ εἰσὶν αἱ ἁγιάζουσαι καὶ τελειοῦσαι τὰ θεῖα δῶρα, ἤγουν τό, 'Λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου·' καὶ τό, 'Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου.' Καὶ συμφωνοῦμεν καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ὑμῖν· οὐ γὰρ δοξάζομεν ἄλλο παρὸ ὑμεῖς λέγετε καὶ δοξάζετε. Συμβάλλεσθαι δὲ φάμεν καὶ τὸν ἱερέα πρὸς ταῦτα ὡς τὸν γεωργὸν πρὸς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς φυομένων. Τὸ δὲ πᾶν εἰς τὰς Δεσποτικὰς ἐκείνας φωνὰς ἀνάγομεν, καὶ ἐσμὲν καὶ εἰς τοῦτο σύμφωνοι ὑμῖν." P. 293.

Mark of Ephesus. † 1451 A.D.

Ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς τῶν Δεσποτικῶν ῥημάτων ἁγιάζονται τὰ θεῖα δῶρα, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς μετὰ ταῦτα εὐχῆς καὶ εὐλογίας τοῦ ἱερέως δυνάμει τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

Ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν διαδεξαμένων αὐτοὺς διδασκάλων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, τὴν τῆς μυστικῆς λειτουργίας ἔκθεσιν παρειληφότες, παρ' οὐδενὶ τούτων εὕρομεν ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν δεσποτικῶν ῥημάτων καὶ μόνον ἁγιάζεσθαι καὶ τελειοῦσθαι τὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας δῶρον, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ Δεσποτικὸν σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταποιεῖσθαι· ἀλλὰ προλεγόμενα μὲν διηγηματικῶς τὰ ῥήματα παρὰ πᾶσι συμφώνως ἡμᾶς τε ἀναφέροντας τὰ πρὸς τὴν μνήμην τοῦ τότε πραχθέντος καὶ δύναμιν ὥσπερ ἐνιέντα τοῖς προκειμένοις εἰς τὴν μεταβολήν· ἐπιγινομένην δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν εὐχήν τε καὶ εὐλογίαν τοῦ ἱερέως, ἐνεργείᾳ μεταποιεῖν ἤδη τὰ δῶρα πρὸς αὐτὸ πρωτότυπον ἐκεῖνο σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τὸ Δεσποτικόν. Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ αἱ ἐκθέσεις αὐταὶ μαρτυροῦσι, σύμφωνοι παρ' ἡμῖν εὑρισκόμεναι, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐπὶ ταύταις ἀποδοθήσεται. . . .[1] Οὕτω μὲν ἅπαντες οὗτοι συμφώνως προλέγουσι μὲν τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἡμᾶς ἄγουσι τοῦ τότε πραχθέντος, καὶ τὴν ἁγιαστικὴν δύναμιν ἐνιᾶσι τελουμένοις· ἐπεύχονται ὕστερον καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπικαλοῦνται χάριν, ὥστε αὐτὴν ἐλθοῦσαν, τὰ εἰρημένα τότε τοῖς νῦν ἐφαρμόσαι, καὶ τὰ προκείμενα τελειῶσαι, καὶ πρὸς τὸ Δεσποτικὸν σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταποιῆσαι· αὕτη γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ τῆς παρθένου τὴν θεοφόρον ἐκείνην συνεστήσατο σάρκα, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον πρὸς αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου· "Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι." Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος, μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα διηγηματικῶς ὡς παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰρη-

[1] The quotations from the Liturgies of S. James, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, and from the Liturgy in the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions, are omitted here for the sake of brevity. See above, pp. 253, 273, 287, 289.

μένα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος, ἀντίτυπα καλεῖ τὰ προκείμενα, δῆλον ὡς μήπω τετελεσμένα διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων, ἀλλ' ἔτι τύπον τινὰ καὶ εἰκόνα φέροντα. Καὶ οὕτως εὐθὺς ἐφεξῆς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐλθεῖν ἐπεύχεται, καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα, τὸ δὲ ποτήριον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα. Καὶ τοῦτό γε λίαν εἰκότως· καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης ἐκείνης δημιουργίας ἔλαβε μὲν ἡ γῆ τὴν τοῦ βλαστάνειν τὰ ἐξ αὐτῆς δύναμιν διὰ τοῦ θείου προστάγματος, καὶ τὸ πρόσταγμα ἐκεῖνο, καθά φησιν ὁ αὐτὸς διδάσκαλος, ἐναπομεῖναν τῇ γῇ, τὴν τοῦ βλαστάνειν αὐτῇ διηνεκῶς παρέχεται δύναμιν· χρεία δὲ ὅμως καὶ ἡμετέρας ἐπιμελείας, καὶ γεωργικῶν χειρῶν εἰς τὸ τελεσιουργεῖν τὰ φυόμενα· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ἅπαξ ῥηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ὡς καὶ ὁ θεῖός φησι Χρυσόστομος, διὰ παντὸς ἐνεργεῖ· συνεργεῖ δὲ ὅμως καὶ ἡ τῆς θείας ἱερωσύνης δύναμις διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς καὶ τῆς εὐλογίας εἰς τὴν τῶν προκειμένων τελείωσιν· αὕτη γὰρ καὶ τὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὕδωρ ὂν ἁπλῶς ἐκ τοῦ φαινομένου πάσης ἁμαρτίας καθαρτικὸν ἀπεργάζεται, τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος ἀθεωρήτως συντρέχοντος· αὕτη καὶ τὸ χρίσμα τοῦ μύρου καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτοὺς καὶ τἄλλα πάντα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μυστήρια τελεσιουργεῖ διὰ τῆς τοῦ Παναγίου Πνεύματος χάριτος. Οὐ τοίνυν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ εὐχῇ θαρροῦντες, οὐδὲ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων ἀδυναμίαν καταγινώσκοντες, ἐπευχόμεθα τοῖς προκειμένοις, καὶ οὕτως αὐτὰ τελειοῦσθαι πιστεύομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ῥήματα τὴν οἰκείαν σώζειν ὁμολογοῦμεν ἰσχύν, καὶ τὴν τῆς θείας ἱερωσύνης ἐπιδείκνυμεν δύναμιν, τελειωτικὴν οὖσαν παντὸς μυστηρίου τῇ ἐπικλήσει τοῦ δι' αὐτῆς ἐνεργοῦντος Ἁγίου Πνεύματος· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ὁ θεῖος Χρυσόστομος αὖθις ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἱερωσύνης τρίτῳ περὶ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοιάδε φησίν· "Ἕστηκεν . . . πεπυρωμένου."[1] Ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀμφιβολίαν τινὰ καὶ ἀδηλίαν εὐχομένους ἡμᾶς ὑποπτεύειν χρεών, αὐτοῦ τοῦ θειουμένου καὶ

[1] *De Sacerdotio*, iii., 4. See above, p. 261.

μεταλαμβανομένου Δεσπότου κελεύσαντος τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἡμᾶς· "Τοῦτο γάρ," φησί, "ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν·" καὶ ἐπαγγειλαμένου δώσειν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτὸ ἅπασι, μήτι γε ἱερεῦσι, καὶ σφόδρα γε βουλομένου τοῦτο καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπιτελεῖσθαι παρ' ἡμῶν, ὡς διὰ πάντων ἐξῆς ἀναφαίνεται. Ἡ σύ γε τυχὸν ἐκ τούτου, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὑποπτεύσειας, δι' εὐχῶν ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπικλήσεων τελειούμενον, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἄφεσιν, εἰ ἀληθῶς ἐδέξω, δισταγμόν τινα σχοίης διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς χάριτος ἐπιδιδομένην, καὶ τἄλλα πάνθ' ὁμοίως ἐκκλησιαστικὰ μυστήρια διαγράψειας. Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔστι· πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος, μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσεσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας ἁπάσας, ἄχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. Ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν ταῦτα παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ ἐκείνους ἐκδεξαμένων παραλάβοντες, καὶ κατέχομεν ἀμεταποιήτως, καὶ τὸν γιγνόμενον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἀποδίδομεν λόγον· ὅτι δὲ ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων λόγος, ἐν εἴδει διηγήσεως λεγόμενος, πρὸς ἁγιασμὸν δώρων ἀρκεῖ, οὐδεὶς οὔτε τῶν ἀποστόλων, οὔτε τῶν διδασκάλων εἰπὼν φαίνεται. Ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν ἅπαξ ὑπ' ἐκείνου ῥηθῆναι, καθάπερ ὁ δημιουργικὸς λόγος ἀεὶ ἐνεργεῖ, τοῦτό φησιν ὁ τὴν γλῶτταν χρυσοῦς Ἰωάννης. Ὅτι δὲ νῦν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως λεγόμενος, διὰ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λέγεσθαι τοῦτο δύναται, οὐδαμόθεν ἔστι μαθεῖν· ἐπεὶ οὐδ' αὐτὸς ὁ δημιουργικὸς λόγος ἐνεργεῖ, ὅτι ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ τῶν γενομένων ὑπό τινος ἀνθρώπου λέγεται· ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐστὶν ἅπαξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰρημένος. Καὶ μὴν οὐδ' αὐτοὶ φήσουσιν ἐνεργεῖν τὸν Δεσποτικὸν λόγον, ὑπὸ τοῦ τυχόντος ἁπλῶς λεγόμενος, οὐδ' ἄνευ θυσιαστηρίου. Εἰ τοίνυν ἱερέως δεῖ καὶ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα πρὸς τοῦτο συντείνει, διὰ τί μὴ καὶ εὐχῶν, δεήσεως, εὐλογίας, καὶ τῆς δι' αὐτῆς ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἥτις πάντα τελειοῖ τὰ μυστήρια; Πρὸς τούτους ὁ ἱερὸς Διονύσιος ἐπιμαρτυρήσων παρίτω τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν τελουμένοις· ἐν γὰρ τῇ θεωρίᾳ τοῦ τῆς συνάξεως μυστηρίου, "Τὰς ἱεράς, φησί, θεουργίας

ὁ ἱεράρχης ὑμνήσας, ἐπὶ τὴν ἱερουργίαν ἔρχεται· καὶ πρότερον μὲν ὑπὲρ ταύτης ἀπολογεῖται καὶ ἀναβοᾷ 'Σὺ εἶπας, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν·' εἶτα τῆς θεομιμήτου ταύτης ἱερουργίας ἄξιος αἰτεῖ γενέσθαι, καὶ τῇ πρὸς Χριστὸν ἀφομοιώσει τὰ θεῖα πανάγνως τελέσαι καὶ διαδοῦναι, καὶ τοὺς μεθέξοντας ἱεροπρεπῶς μετασχεῖν. Εἶθ' οὕτως ἱερουργεῖ τὰ θειότατα, καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγει τὰ ὑμνημένα διὰ τῶν ἱερῶς προκειμένων· τὸν γὰρ ἐγκεκαλυμμένον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον ἄρτον ἀνακαλύψας, εἰς πολλὰ διελών, καὶ τὸ ἑνιαῖον τοῦ ποτηρίου πᾶσι καταμερίσας, συμβολικῶς τὴν ἑνότητα πληθύνει καὶ διανέμει·" καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα· "Μετασχὼν δὲ καὶ μεταδοὺς ὁ ἱεράρχης, εἰς εὐχαριστίαν ἱερὰν καταλήγει."

Ταῦτα συνορᾶν ἔξεστι τῷ βουλομένῳ παντί, τίσι ἐστὶ σύμφωνα, τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν τελουμένοις, ἢ τοῖς παρὰ Λατίνων. Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀκολουθοῦντες τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ διδασκάλοις, κατὰ τὰς ὑπ' αὐτῶν παραδεδομένας ἐκθέσεις, καὶ τούτῳ δὴ τῷ ἱεροφάντορι, τὰς ἱερὰς θεουργίας ὑμνοῦμεν, τουτέστιν, ὡς αὐτός φησι, τὴν δι' ἡμᾶς ἐνανθρώπησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ θάνατον, τὴν θεογενεσίαν τῶν βαπτιζομένων, τὴν θείαν υἱοθεσίαν, τὴν διὰ τῆς φυλακῆς τῶν ἐντολῶν θέωσιν· εἶθ' οὕτως ἐπὶ τὴν ἱερουργίαν ἐρχόμενοι, πρότερον μὲν ὑπὲρ ταύτης ἀπολογούμεθα, καὶ ἀναβοῶμεν αὐτὰ τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα, ἃ τότε εἶπε· καὶ ἐπιλέγομεν, ὅτι αὐτὸς προσέταξε, "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν·" εἶτα τῆς θεομιμήτου ταύτης ἱερουργίας ἄξιοι αἰτήσαντες γενέσθαι, καθὰ περιέχουσιν αἱ ἐκθέσεις, ἱερουργοῦμεν τὰ θειότατα διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς καὶ εὐλογίας καὶ τῆς τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως· καὶ τὸν ἐγκεκαλυμμένον τέως καὶ ἀδιαίρετον ἄρτον ἀνακαλύψαντες, εἰς πολλὰ διαιροῦμεν, καὶ τὸ ἑνιαῖον τοῦ ποτηρίου πᾶσι καταμερίζομεν. Ὁ δὲ παρὰ Λατίνοις ἱερεὺς μέμνηται μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς διηγηματικῶς τῶν Δεσποτικῶν ῥημάτων, ὅτι αὐτὸς προσέταξε, "Λάβετε, φάγετε," καὶ "Πίετε πάντες,"

καί, "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν·" ἱερουργεῖ δὲ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον, ἀλλ' οἴεται τὴν διήγησιν αὐτὴν τῶν ῥημάτων πρὸς τὸν ἁγιασμὸν καὶ τὴν ἱερουργίαν ἀρκεῖν· εἶτα τὸν ἄζυμον ἄρτον ἐκεῖνον, οὐκ ἐγκεκαλυμμένον τέως, ἀλλ' ὅθεν ἔτυχεν οὕτω λαβὼν καὶ ὑψώσας, μέρος μὲν ἀπορρήγνυσι, καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ ἐμβάλλει· τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν καθίησιν εἰς τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἐκπιὼν ὅλον ὁμοίως, ἀσπάζεσθαι αὐτὸν προτρέπεται τοὺς συλλειτουργοῦντας αὐτῷ διακόνους, μηδενὶ μηδὲν μεταδούς, ὁ τὸ "Λάβετε, φάγετε πάντες," καὶ "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες," μεγαλαυχῶν. Ταῦτα οὐ πρόδηλον φέρει τὴν ἐναντίωσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰς παραδεδομένας ἐκθέσεις καὶ ἐξηγήσεις πρὸς τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὰς τὰς ἐκείνων φωνάς; Εἶτα τολμήσουσιν οὕτως ἔχοντες ἐγκαλεῖν ἡμῖν καὶ περιεργάζεσθαι τὰ ἡμετέρα καὶ ἐφερμηνεύειν, οὕτως ἀκόλουθα τοῖς ἁγίοις ὄντα; Ἀλλ' ὁ Χρυσόστομός φησι τὸν Δεσποτικὸν λόγον ἅπαξ ῥηθέντα τὴν θυσίαν ἀπηρτισμένην ἐργάζεσθαι· ἅπαξ ῥηθέντα φησὶν οὐ νῦν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως λεγόμενον, ἀλλ' ἅπαξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ῥηθέντα, τὴν τελειωτικὴν ἀεὶ δύναμιν ἐνιέναι τοῖς προκειμένοις, οὐκ ἤδη καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ τελειοῦν αὐτά· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις ἐργάζεται διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἱερέως [sc. ἐπικλήσεως], καὶ δῆλον ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς ὁ χρυσοῦς τὴν γλῶτταν, ὡς πρότερον ἐξεθέμεθα, μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα, "Κατάπεμψον," φησί, "τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ." Ταῦτα εἰ μὴ πείθουσι τοὺς φιλονείκως ἔχοντας, ἐλεεῖσθαι ἂν εἶεν δίκαιοι τῆς διπλῆς ἀγνοίας, καὶ τῆς εἰς βάθος πωρώσεως. P. G. clx., 1080–1089.

Orthodox Confession. 1643 A.D.

Ἐρώτησις ρ'.

Πόσα πράγματα ζητοῦνται εἰς τὸ μυστήριον;

Ἀπ. Τρία, ὕλη ἁρμόδιος, ὡς εἶναι τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς τὸ βάπ-

τισμα· ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος εἰς τὴν εὐχαριστίαν· τὸ ἔλαιον, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κατὰ τὸ μυστήριον. Δεύτερον ὁ ἱερεύς, ὅπου νὰ εἶναι νομίμως κεχειροτονημένος ἢ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος. Τρίτον ἡ ἐπίκλησις τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῶν λογίων, μετὰ ὁποῖα ὁ ἱερεὺς ἁγιάζει τὸ μυστήριον τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος μὲ γνώμην ἀποφασισμένην του νὰ τὸ ἁγιάσῃ. SCHAFF, *The Creeds of Christendom*, ii., 374–375.

Ἐρώτησις ρζ'.

Τί πρέπει νὰ φυλάττεται εἰς τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο;

Ἀπ. . . . Τέταρτον πρέπει, νὰ ἔχῃ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοιαύτην γνώμην εἰς τὸν καιρόν, ὅπου ἁγιάζει τὰ δῶρα, πῶς αὐτὴ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ οἴνου μεταβάλλεται εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὗ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν κάμει τὴν ὥραν ἐκείνην, διανατελῶς τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, ἐπευχόμενος καὶ λέγων· "Κατάπεμψον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ Ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα· καὶ ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ." Μετὰ γὰρ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἡ μετουσίωσις παρευθὺς γίνεται, καὶ ἀλλήσει ὁ ἄρτος εἰς τὸ ἀληθινὸν σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ὁ οἶνος εἰς τὸ ἀληθινὸν αἷμα. SCHAFF, *op. cit.* ii., 381–382.

Synod of Jerusalem. 1672 A.D.

Ὅρος ιε'.

. . . Ἀποπτύομεν δὲ ὡς ἀλλότριον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς διδασκαλίας τὸ τὴν ἀκεραιότητα τῶν μυστηρίων ἀπαιτεῖν τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ γηΐνου πράγματος· ἀντίκειται γὰρ τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῆς προσφορᾶς, ὃ ῥήματι ὑπαρκτικῷ νομοθετηθὲν καὶ τῇ ἐπικλήσει τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἁγιασθὲν τελειοῦται τῇ ὑπάρξει τοῦ σημαινομένου, τοῦ σώματος δηλαδὴ καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. . . . SCHAFF, *op. cit.* ii., 422–423.

Declaration of Greeks to the Marquis de Nointel
c. 1671 A.D.

Περὶ δὲ τοῦ φρικτοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, πιστεύομεν καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν ἀδιστάκτως, ὅτι τὸ ζῶν σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πάρεστιν ἀοράτως πραγματικῇ παρουσίᾳ ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ· ἐν γὰρ τῷ εἰπεῖν τὸν λειτουργοῦντα ἱερέα μετὰ τὰ Κυριακὰ λόγια, "Ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ," τότε τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τοῦ Παναγίου Πνεύματος, ὑπερφυῶς καὶ ἀρρήτως ὁ μὲν ἄρτος μεταποιεῖται εἰς αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα τοῦ Σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ πραγματικῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς καὶ κυρίως, ὁ δὲ οἶνος εἰς τὸ ζωηρὸν αἷμα αὐτοῦ.

Covel, *Some Account of the Present Greek Church, etc.*, p. 44.

Oath of a Russian Bishop at his Consecration

Еще вѣрую и мудрствую совершатися въ Божественнѣй литургіи пресуществленію Тѣла и Крове Христовы, яко восточніи и наши Россійскіи учителіе древніи учатъ, наитіемъ и дѣйствіемъ Святаго Духа чрезъ призываніе Архіерейское, или іерейское, въ словесѣхъ Богу Отцу молительныхъ: „сотвори убо хлѣбъ сей, честное Тѣло Христа Твоего," и прочая.

Maltzew, *Die Sacramente, etc.*, pp. 408–409.

Gabriel of Philadelphia. 1541–1616 A.D.
Apologia pro Ecclesia Orient.

Διὰ τοῦτο δικαίως καὶ εὐλόγως τιμᾶται, καὶ προπέμπεται, καὶ ὑμνεῖται ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Χριστιανῶν οὐκ ὡς σάρκα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δῶρον ἅγιον, καὶ ὕλην ἀναγκαίον γενέσθαι εὐθὺς διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος αἷμα καὶ σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

. . . τῆς μετουσιώσεως, τῆς διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἱερέως εὐλογίας καὶ ἐντεύξεως, ἁγιασμὸν ἐχούσης ἀνεξάλειπτον, τιμὴν καὶ

κλῖσιν κεφαλῆς καὶ γονάτων ἀπαγορεύετε μὴ προσφέρειν; . . . τὰ δὲ ἅγια δῶρα, κατὰ δῶρα ἅγια καὶ ὕλην ἀφιερωμένην τῷ Θεῷ ὁρισμένην καὶ ἐπιτηδείαν, διὰ τῆς εὐλογίας καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν εὐχῶν γενέσθαι σάρκα Χριστοῦ καὶ αἷμα, μᾶλλον τιμᾶσθαι δέον καὶ γεραίρεσθαι.

Opuscula, ed. R. Simon, pp. 6, 15–16.

Eustratius Argentes. † c. 1755–1760 A.D.

Σύνταγμα κατὰ Ἀξύμων. Τμ. Β'. Πρότ. α'

Ἐπειδήπερ ὁ ἁγιασμὸς τοῦ Κυριακοῦ Δείπνου, ὁ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἱερέων γινόμενος, ὀφειλει ὑπάρχειν τεθεμελιωμένος ἐπάνω εἰς τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅστις ὕστερα ἀπὸ τὴν ὑπουργίαν τοῦ ἱερωτάτου ἐκείνου συμποσίου, προσέταξε λέγων· "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε." Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς φροντίζομεν καὶ ἐπιμελούμεθα, ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ Προτάσει στοχάσασθαι καὶ ἐρευνῆσαι, τίνι τρόπῳ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἱερούργησε τὸν ἄρτον τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον. Καὶ ἀφοῦ μάθωμεν τοῦτο, τότε εὔκολον εἶναι νὰ καταλάβωμεν, καὶ τὸν τρόπον ὁποῦ οἱ Ἱερεῖς πρέπει νὰ ἱερουργοῦσιν· ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἱερουργία τῶν Ἱερέων, εἶναι συμπέρασμα τῆς ἱερουργίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Πρότασις Α'

Ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' εὐχαριστίας, καὶ εὐλογίας, καὶ ἐπικλήσεως, ἱερούργησε, καὶ μετουσίωσε τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον, εἰς ἴδιον ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα· οὐχὶ δὲ διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων· "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου." Εἴρηκε γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ λόγια, ἵνα σαφηνίσῃ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, τί εἴη ἐκεῖνο, ὅπερ ἤδη τότε εὐλόγησεν. P. 59 a.

Ibid. Τμ. Β'. Πρότ. α'. (ν')

Συμπεραίνομεν τοιγαροῦν, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς διὰ τῆς παντοδυνάμου αὐτοῦ εὐλογίας, ὡς Θεὸς ἱερούργησε, καὶ μετουσίωσε τὸν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον εἰς Σῶμα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Αἷμα· ἀλλ' ὡς ὢν καὶ τελειος ἄνθρωπος,

συνῆψε τῇ θείᾳ αὐτοῦ εὐλογίᾳ καὶ εὐχαριστίας, καὶ εὐχάς, καὶ ἐπικλήσεις πρὸς τὸν οὐράνιον αὐτοῦ Πατέρα, ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἀναδείξας τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ τὰ προκείμενα. . . . Εἶτα παρέσχεν αὐτά, καὶ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν καὶ ποιεῖν, ἐξηγησάμενος αὐτοῖς, καὶ τί εἴη τὸ διδόμενον, Σῶμα δηλονότι καὶ Αἷμα αὐτοῦ.

Τοιγαροῦν τὰ ῥήματα ἐκεῖνα ἐξηγητικὰ μόνον τοῦ Μυστηρίου εἰσίν, οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἁγιαστικά, ἡ γὰρ μετουσίωσις, διὰ τῆς εὐλογίας, καὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ ἐπικλήσεως ἐγένετο, ὅπερ ἔδει ἀποδεῖξαι. P. 65 a.

Ibid. Τμ. Β′. Πρότ. α′. προσ. β′. κεφ. γ′

Περὶ τοῦ, τί σημαίνει ἡ εὐλογία τῶν κτισμάτων, ἡ γινομένη πρὸς τὰ λοιπὰ κτίσματα.

"Πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθή, καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον, ἄνωθέν ἐστι καταβαῖνον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων," φησὶν ὁ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἱερὸς Ἀδελφόθεος· *τοιγαροῦν καὶ πᾶσα εὐλογία, ἡ πρὸς τὰ κτίσματα γινομένη, ὀφειλει παρ' τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν φώτων, τουτέστιν ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ προέρχεσθαι· καὶ ἀγκαλὰ καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγονται εὐλογεῖν ἄλλα κτίσματα, ὅμως αὕτη ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη εὐλογία καταχρηστικῶς εὐλογία ὀνομάζεται· μόνος γὰρ ὁ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ κυρίως εὐλογῶν αὐτά· ἡ δὲ διαφορὰ τῆς θείας εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην εὐλογίαν ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ συνίσταται· τουτέστιν, ὅτι ἐκείνη μὲν ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀμέσως προέρχεται, ἡ δὲ ἀνθρωπίνη εὐλογία δι' εὐχῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐμμέσως παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τελεσιουργεῖται. Οἱ ἄνθρωποι τοιγαροῦν, ἐπιχειριζόμενοι εὐλογῆσαί τι κτίσμα, οὐδὲν ἄλλο πράττουσιν, εἰ μὴ εὐχάς, καὶ δεήσεις, καὶ ἐπικλήσεις τοῦ θείου ὀνόματος ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς καταξιώσῃ εὐλογῆσαι καὶ δωρήσασθαι τοῖς ἄλλοις κτίσμασι ἐκεῖνο τὸ καλόν, τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐξαιτούμενον. Πράττουσι δὲ τοῦτο οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπίνης θελήσεως, οὔτε ἐξ ἰδίας ὁρμῆς κινούμενοι, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐντολὴν καὶ προσταγὴν θεϊκήν· ἀναγινώσκομεν γὰρ τὴν τρανωτάτην ταύτην*

προσταγὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ (Κεφ. ς'. τοῦ Βιβλ. τῶν Ἀριθ.), ἔνθα ὁ Θεὸς ταῦτα ἐντελλεται πρὸς Μωϋσῆν "Λάλησον Ἀαρὼν καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ, λέγων· Οὕτως εὐλογήσετε τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ, λέγοντες αὐτοῖς· Εὐλογήσαι σε Κύριος καὶ φυλάξαι σε, Κύριος ἐπιφάναι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δῴη σοι εἰρήνην" καὶ ἐπιθήσουσι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐγὼ Κύριος εὐλογήσω αὐτούς." Προφανέστατον ἄρα ἐγένετο, ὅτι οἱ ἄνθρωποι, βουλόμενοι ἄλλο τι κτίσμα εὐλογῆσαι, οὐδὲν ὀφειλουσι ποιεῖν ἕτερον, εἰμὴ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα εὐλογήσῃ ἐκεῖνο τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὅπερ οἱ ἄνθρωποι αὐτοὶ βούλονται γενέσθαι εὐλογημένον· τοῦτον τὸν κανόνα, καὶ ταύτην τὴν θείαν ἐντολήν, ἠκολούθησαν σύμπαντες οἱ πάλαι Πατέρες καὶ Πατριάρχαι ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν ἄλλα κτίσματα, τὸ ὁποῖον διὰ τρανωτάτων παραδειγμάτων ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς Κεφαλ. ἀποδειχθήσεται. P. 73 b.

Ibid. Τμ. Β'. Πρότ. α'. προσ. β'. κεφ. ς'

Δείκνυται τοῦτο αὐτὸ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς συνηθείας τῶν Χριστιανῶν.

Ἐάν τις τῶν Χριστιανῶν ζητήσῃ εὐλογίαν παρ' Ἐπισκόπου, ἢ Ἱερέως, ἢ γονέων, ἢ γέροντος, καὶ εἴπῃ πρὸς αὐτόν· "Εὐλόγησόν με Πάτερ!" οὐκ ἀποκρίνεται, λέγων· "Εὐλογῶ σε!" ἀλλ' ἀποκρίνεται, λέγων· "Ὁ Θεὸς εὐλογήσαι σε!" ἢ "Εἷης εὐλογημένος παρὰ Θεοῦ!" ἢ "Ὁ Θεὸς φυλάξαι σε! σώσαι σε! ἁγιάσαι σε! βοηθήσαι σοι! ὑγιάνοι σε! ἐλεήσαι σε!" καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. Καὶ κατὰ λόγον τῆς ζητουμένης εὐλογίας προσευχὴν πρὸς Θεὸν μεταχειρίζεται ὁ εὐλογῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ζητοῦντος τὴν εὐλογίαν· ὥστε τόσον εἶναι νὰ εἴπῃ κἀνεὶς τοῦ Ἱερέως, "Εὐλόγησόν με Πάτερ!" καὶ τόσον εἶναι νὰ εἴπῃ, "Εὖξαι ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, Πάτερ!"

P. 75 a.

Ibid. Τμ. Β'. Πρότ. β'

Οἱ Ἱερεῖς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὀφειλουσιν ἱερουργεῖν τὸν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον τοῦ Κυριακοῦ Δείπνου δι' εὐχαριστίας, καὶ

εὐλογίας, καὶ ἐπικλήσεως, οὐχὶ διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων, "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου," ὀφειλουσι δὲ προφέρειν καὶ ταῦτα τὰ λόγια, οὐχὶ πρὸς τὸ ἱερουργῆσαι, ἀλλ' ἵνα δείξωσιν, ὅτι σκοποῦσιν ἐπιτελέσαι ἐκεῖνο, ὅπερ ἐποίησεν ὁ Χριστός· καὶ προσέτι ὀφείλουσιν ἐξηγεῖν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας τὸ διδόμενον αὐτοῖς, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐξήγησεν αὐτὸ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀποστόλους. Pp. 85 b–86 a.

Ibid. Τμ. Β'. Πρότ. β'. (α')

Ἐπειδὴ ἀπεδείχθη σαφέστατά τε καὶ καθαρώτατα, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς δι' εὐλογίας, καὶ εὐχαριστίας, καὶ ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ οὐρανίου Πατρὸς ἱερούργησε τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυριακοῦ Δείπνου, καὶ μετουσίωσεν αὐτὰ εἰς ἐδικόν του σῶμα καὶ αἷμα, καὶ ἔπειτα ἐξήγησε καὶ ἐσαφήνισε πρὸς τοὺς Μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, τί εἴη τὸ εὐλογηθὲν ἐκεῖνο, καὶ διδόμενον αὐτοῖς· καὶ τελος προσέταξεν αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν τὸ αὐτό, ὅπερ ἐποίησεν αὐτός, εἰπών· "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε·" πρόδηλον γίνεται, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὀφειλουσι μιμεῖσθαι αὐτόν, καὶ ποιεῖν ἀπαραλλάκτως, ὅ, τι ἐποίησεν αὐτός. P. 86 a.

Ibid. Τμ. Β'. Πρότ. β'. (ξή, ξθ')

Ὁ γὰρ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς, ἐξετέλεσε τὸ ἱερὸν ἐκεῖνο δεῖπνον, καὶ ὡς Θεός, καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ καθὸ μὲν Θεός, τῇ θείᾳ καὶ παντοδυνάμῳ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ εὐλόγησε, καὶ μετουσίωσε τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ τὸν οἶνον εἰς σῶμα ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ αἷμα· καθὸ δὲ ἄνθρωπος, συνῆψε τῇ θείᾳ αὐτοῦ εὐλογίᾳ προσευχὰς πρὸς Θεόν, καὶ ἐπικλήσεις, ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς οὐρανὸν πρὸς παντοδύναμον Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας αὐτῷ, εὐλόγησεν, ἱερούργησε, καὶ μετουσίωσε τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον.

Καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἐστίν, ὅπερ ἐντειλατο ἡμῖν ποιεῖν, εἰπών· "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε·" τουτέστιν, ὅσον ἐποίησεν αὐτός, καθὸ ἄνθρωπος· ὅσον δὲ πάλιν ἐποίησε, καθὸ Θεός, δὲν ἠμπορεῖ ὁ ἱερεὺς νὰ τὸ μιμηθῇ, ἀλλὰ μόνον δέεται καὶ ἐπικαλεῖ καὶ

ἱκτεύει, ἵνα τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ οὐρανίου Πατρός, καὶ συνεργείᾳ τοῦ μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ, κατέλθῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ καὶ τελειώσῃ τὴν ἄρρητον καὶ θείαν ἐκείνην μεταβολήν.

P. 100 a, b.

Ibid. Τμ. Β'. Πρότ. β'. (οβ', ογ', οδ', οε', ος')

Ἐκ τῶν ῥηθέντων τοιγαροῦν, ἐπληροφορήθημεν· (α'.) Ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς, Θεὸς ὢν ἀληθινὸς, τῇ θείᾳ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει καὶ παντοδυνάμῳ ἐξουσίᾳ εὐλόγησε καὶ μετουσίωσε τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον εἰς ἴδιον καὶ ἀληθὲς αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα· οὐχὶ δὲ διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων, "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου." (β'.) Ὕστερα ἀπὸ τὴν εὐλογίαν τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ οἴνου, ἔκλασε τὸν ἄρτον καὶ ἐκέρασε καὶ τὸν οἶνον· καὶ ἔπειτα ἔδωκε τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ Ἀποστόλοις. (γ'.) Καὶ ἐν τῷ διδόναι ἐξήγησε καὶ ἐσαφήνισεν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἔννοιαν καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ διδομένου, εἰπὼν αὐτοῖς· "Λάβετε, φάγετε, πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου." (δ'.) Ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, ὡς ὢν καὶ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, συνῆψε τῇ θεϊκῇ αὐτοῦ εὐλογίᾳ καὶ εὐχάς, καὶ εὐχαριστίας, καὶ ἐπικλήσεις, πρὸς τὸν οὐράνιον αὐτοῦ Πατέρα καὶ Θεόν. (ε'.) Ὅτι τέλος πάντων προσέταξε τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς, ποιεῖν ὅσον ἐποίησεν αὐτός, εἰπών· "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν."

Τὸ δὲ τί δηλοῖ ἡ εὐλογία, καὶ πόσα σημαινόμενα ἔχει, καὶ ποίαν διαφορὰν ἔχει ἡ εὐλογία τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τὴν εὐλογίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ μὲ ποῖον τρόπον ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εὐλογεῖν καὶ ἁγιάζειν τὰ Μυστήρια, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἱερατικὰ πράγματα, ἐξηγήθη καὶ ἀπεδείχθη τρανώτατα ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Β'. Προσθήκῃ τῆς Α'. Προτάσεως.

Λοιπὸν καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ἐπιχειριζόμενοι ἐκτελέσαι τὸ ἱερὸν Μυστήριον τοῦ Κυριακοῦ Δείπνου, ὀφείλουσι. (Α'.) Λαμβάνειν ἄρτον ἀληθινόν, καὶ οἶνον συνειθισμένον ὕδατι κεκραμένον. (Β'.) Ἔπειτα δοξολογεῖν καὶ ὑμνεῖν τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγα-

θῶν καὶ εὐεργεσιῶν, ἃς ἐποίησε τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων. (Γ'.) Μνημονεύειν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τῆς συλλήψεως, καὶ γεννήσεως, καὶ βαπτίσμου, καὶ διδαχῆς, καὶ θαυμασίων, καὶ προδοσίας, καὶ πάθους, καὶ σταυρώσεως, καὶ ταφῆς, καὶ ἀναστάσεως, καὶ ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ· ἐπειδὴ εἶπε, "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν." (Δ'.) Μάλιστα δὲ πάντων ὀφείλουσι, μνημονεύειν τῆς νυκτὸς ἐκείνης, ἐν ᾗ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος, ἐξετέλεσε τὸ Μυστικὸν ἐκεῖνο δεῖπνον· ὅτε λαβὼν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας, καὶ εὐλογήσας, ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ Ἀποστόλοις, εἰπών· "Λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου·" καὶ "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου." Ταύτην, φημί, τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, ὀφείλουσι διηγεῖσθαι οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ προφέρειν ῥητῶς, καὶ ἐκεῖνα τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου, οὐχ ἵνα διὰ τούτων ἱερουργήσωσιν, ἀλλ' ἵνα δι' αὐτῶν παραστήσωσιν, ὅτι σκοποῦσιν ἐπιτελέσαι αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο, ὅπερ ἐποίησεν ὁ Χριστός, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν αὐτοῦ. (Ε'.) Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὀφείλουσιν εὔχεσθαι, καὶ μετὰ θερμῶν δεήσεων ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν Θεόν, ἵνα καταπέμψῃ τὸ Πανάγιον Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἱερουργήσῃ, καὶ μετουσιώσῃ τὸν ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα· τὸν δὲ οἶνον, εἰς αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου· τὴν ὁποίαν ἐπίκλησιν, ἡ Ἐκκλησία ὀνομάζει εὐλογίαν. (ς'.) Καὶ ὕστερα ἀπὸ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν ἀκολουθεῖ ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, καθὼς ἔκαμεν ὁ Χριστός· ταύτην δὲ τὴν κλάσιν τοῦ ἄρτου νῦν ἡ Ἐκκλησία μελισμὸν τοῦ ἄρτου ὀνομάζει. (Ζ'.) Καὶ τέλος πάντων, ὁ ἱερεὺς διαδίδει τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσι τὸ Μυστήριον, ἐξηγούμενος αὐτοῖς τὴν ἔννοιαν τῶν διδομένων λόγων πρὸς αὐτούς, ὅτι "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ," καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐποίησεν, εἰπὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου."

Λοιπὸν τὰ Κυριακὰ ταῦτα λόγια κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔχουσι τὸν καιρόν τους εἰς τὴν δόσιν τοῦ Μυστηρίου, καθά-

περ εἶπεν αὐτὰ καὶ ὁ Χριστός· οὐχὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἱερουργίᾳ. Ἡ διαφορὰ μόνον εἶναι, ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπε, "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου," ἐπειδὴ ἔδιδε τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις σῶμα ἐδικόν του· ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς δὲν δίδει σῶμα ἐδικόν του, ἀλλὰ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· διὰ τοῦτο δὲν λέγει, "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου·" ἀλλὰ λέγει, ὅτι "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ τίμιον σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ."

Συμπεραίνομεν λοιπόν, ὅτι οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὀφείλουσι ἱερουργεῖν τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον τοῦ Κυριακοῦ Δείπνου οὐχὶ διὰ τῶν λόγων ἐκείνων, "Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα·" ἀλλὰ διὰ προσευχῆς, καὶ εὐχαριστίας, καὶ εὐλογίας, καὶ ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ θείου ὀνόματος· ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι.

P. 101 a, b.

Ibid. Τμ. Β′. Πρότ. β′. προσ. β′. ἀντ. γ′. (ἀπό. α′.)

Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Χριστός, "Τοῦτο λέγετε," ἀλλ' εἶπε, "Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε·" τουτέστιν, "ἀπαραλλάκτως οὕτω ποιεῖτε, ὅσον εἴδετε τὼς ἔκαμα ἐγώ· ἔλαβα ἄρτον, εὐχαρίστησα, εὐλόγησα, ἔκλασα, ἔδωκα, εἶπα. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε καὶ ὑμεῖς· λάβετε ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσατε, εὐλογήσατε, κλάσατε, δότε, εἴπατε."

P. 120 b.

ΕΓΧΕΙΡΙΔΙΟΝ περίεχον τὰ ἑπτὰ μυστήρια τῆς ἀνατολικῆς, καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας κ.τ.λ. Athens, 1832, p. 23

Πολλαχῶς παρανομοῦσι παῖδες Λατίνων ἐν τῷδε τῷ θειωτάτῳ Μυστηρίῳ, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τὰ τρία ταῦτα . . . β′. Ὅτι καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τῶν προκειμένων οὐ διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν Κυριακῶν λογίων τοῦ "Λάβετε, φάγετε" κ.τ.λ. γίνεσθαι δοξάζουσιν, ἃ διηγηματικῶς παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως λέγεται.

Henke, *Die katholische Lehre über die Consecrationsworte, etc.*, p. 20.

ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΤΟ ΜΕΓΑ. Venice, 1891

Σημ. ὅτι ἡ δεικτικὴ ἀντωνυμία "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου" καὶ πάλιν "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου" οὐκ ἀναφέρεται

εἰς τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ἀλλ' εἰς ἅπερ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λαβὼν τότε ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ἐκεῖνα λόγια ἐπαναλαμβάνεται διηγηματικῶς καὶ ἑπομένως περιττὴ ἡ δεῖξις μᾶλλον δὲ ἐναντία εἰς τὸ ὀρθὸν τῆς ἀνατολικῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας φρόνημα. P. 63 n.

ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΚΗ, ὑπὸ Π. ΡΟΜΠΟΤΟΥ. Athens, 1869

Βιβλ. β'. κεφ. β'

Ἐκφωνεῖ καὶ τὰ δι' ὧν διέταξε τὸ μυστήριον ὁ Σωτήρ, "Λάβετε, φάγετε . . . " ἵνα εἴπωμεν τὸ Ἀμὴν καὶ συνάμα ἐννοήσωμεν ὅτι δυνάμει τῆς διατάξεως τοῦ Σωτῆρος τελοῦμεν τὸν μυστικὸν Δεῖπνον καὶ ἐπικαλούμεθα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον εἰς ἁγιασμὸν τῶν τιμίων Δώρων . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅταν προεγγίσῃ ἡ ἐπισημοτάτη στιγμὴ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ τῶν Δώρων διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τότε διὰ τῆς ἐκφωνήσεως "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν" . . . ψάλλει ὁ χόρος συντόμως καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὁ λαὸς τὸ "Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν" κτλ., ὅπερ εἶναι ἐν συντόμῳ ἡ Εὐχαριστία, ἣν μυστικῶς εἶπεν ὁ ἱερεύς. Διότι αὕτη ἄρχεται διὰ τοῦ "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, σὲ αἰνεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, σὲ προσκυνεῖν," κτλ. Τὸ δὲ "καὶ δεόμεθα σοῦ" τοῦ "Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν" ἀντιστοιχεῖ εἰς τὴν διὰ πολλῶν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τὴν γινομένην ὅτε ψάλλεται τὸ "Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν." P. 246.

Τὸν ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον περιφράζων καὶ ὁ λειτουργὸς ἐξακολουθεῖ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, εὐχαριστῶν κατόπιν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ διὰ τὴν μεγάλην εὐεργεσίαν τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀποστολῆς τοῦ Μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ τοῦ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν. Διηγεῖται δὲ συντόμως, πῶς πληρώσας τὸ ἔργον τῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας διέταξε καὶ τὸν μυστικὸν Δεῖπνον, καὶ ἐκφωνεῖ τὰς λέξεις "Λάβετε, φάγετε," "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες." Εἰς ταῦτα δὲ ἀπαντᾷ ὁ Χορὸς "Ἀμήν" = γένοιτο· γένοιτο, λέγει,

ἵνα καὶ νῦν ἀξιωθῶμεν τοῦ μυστικοῦ Δείπνου καὶ μεταβληθῇ ὁ ἄρτος εἰς Σῶμα Κυρίου, ὁ δὲ οἶνος εἰς Αἷμα αὐτοῦ.

Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ λειτουργὸς λέγει μυστικῶς "Μεμνημένοι τοίνον τῆς σωτηρίου ταύτης ἐντολῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γεγενημένων, τοῦ Σταυροῦ, τοῦ Τάφου, τῆς τριημέρου Ἀναστάσεως, τῆς εἰς Οὐρανοὺς ἀναβάσεως, τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν καθέδρας, τῆς δευτέρας καὶ ἐνδόξου πάλιν παρουσίας," καὶ ἐκφωνεῖ, ὑψῶν ἅμα τὸ Δισκάριον καὶ τὸ Ποτήριον διὰ σταυροειδῶν χειρῶν, "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρομεν κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα," ἵνα ψάλῃ καὶ ὁ λαὸς διὰ τοῦ Χοροῦ συντόμως τὴν Εὐχαριστίαν "Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν, σὲ εὐλογοῦμεν, σοὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν, Κύριε, καὶ δεόμεθά σου ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν." Ψαλλομένης δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ταύτης, ἐφίσταται ἡ σπουδαιοτάτη στιγμὴ τῆς Λειτουργίας, ὁ δι' ἐπικλήσεως ἁγιασμὸς τῶν τιμίων Δώρων· διότι ὁ ἱερεὺς τότε δέεται καὶ παρακαλεῖ καὶ ἱκετεύει τὸν Θεόν, ἵνα καταπέμψῃ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ Ἅγιον, καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τίμιον Σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ Ποτηρίῳ τίμιον Αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Λέγων δὲ τὸ "Καὶ ποίησον τὸ μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον" σφραγίζει διὰ σταυροειδοῦς εὐλογίας (δι' ἧς ἁγιάζονται πάντα τὰ μυστήρια κατ' ἀρχαιοτάτην παράδοσιν, ὡς σημειοῖ ὁ Μ. Βασίλειος) τὸν ἄρτον· λέγων δὲ τὸ "τὸ ἐν τῷ Ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ" . . . πάλιν σφραγίζει τὸ Ποτήριον κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον· εἰπὼν δὲ τὸ "Μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ," σφραγίζει ἀμφότερα, ἐπιλέγοντος ἑκάστοτε τοῦ διακόνου τὸ Ἀμήν, ὅπερ τρισσεύει ἐν τῷ τελευταίῳ.

Pp. 247–248.

ΙΕΡΑ ΚΑΤΗΧΗΣΙΣ, ὑπὸ Δ. Ν. ΒΕΡΝΑΡΔΑΚΗ. Ἔκδοσις τρίτη. Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, 1876.

§ 105. Ὑπὸ τίνος καὶ πῶς τελεῖται ἡ εὐχαριστία;

. . . Πρὸς τέλεσιν δὲ τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ὁ ἱερεὺς μεταχειρίζεται οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν καὶ καθαρόν, ὃν ἐγχέει μετὰ

ὕδατος εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον, καὶ ἄρτον ἐκ σίτου ἔνζυμον, ἀφ' οὗ δὲ ἐν τῇ λειτουργείᾳ ἐπικαλεσθεὶς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, εὐλογήσῃ τὰ ἅγια δῶρα, μεταβάλλεται ὁ μὲν ἄρτος εἰς τὸ ἄχραντον σῶμα, ὁ δὲ οἶνος μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος εἰς τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Pp. 168–169.

§ 106. Κατὰ τί διαφέρουσιν αἱ ἑτερόδοξοι ἐκκλησίαι ὡς πρὸς τὸ μυστήριον τῆς εὐχαριστίας;

. . . Ἄλλη καινοτομία τῆς λατινικῆς ἐκκλησίας περὶ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο εἶνε, ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἱερουργίᾳ ὁ ἱερεὺς δὲν ἐπικαλεῖται τὸν Θεὸν νὰ ἁγιάσῃ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον, οὐδ' εὐλογεῖ αὐτά, ὅπως παρέλαβε καὶ πράττει ἀνέκαθεν ἡ καθόλου ἐκκλησία, ἀλλ' ἀναφέρει μόνον ἁπλῶς καὶ οὕτως εἰπεῖν ἱστορικῶς τὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα· "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου," καὶ "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου," καὶ πιστεύει ὅτι δι' αὐτῶν καὶ δεικνυόμενα μόνον τὰ ἅγια δῶρα ἡγιάσθησαν καὶ ἐμετουσιώθησαν. Τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πλάνης ταύτης ἐννοεῖ τις ἅμα ὡς ἀναλογισθῇ, ὅτι ὁ τρόπος οὗτος τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ οὐ μόνον εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ διηνεκῆ παράδοσιν καὶ πρᾶξιν τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας ἀντίκειται, ὡς προείπαμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐσιώδη καὶ κύριον ὅρον τῆς τελέσεως παντὸς ἐν γένει μυστηρίου, ὅτι ὁ ἱερεὺς ὀφείλει νὰ εὐχηθῇ ἐπικαλούμενος ἄνωθεν τὴν θείαν χάριν καὶ εὐλογῶν τὴν ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ ὕλην. P. 170.

Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople to the Papal Encyclical on Union. 1896 A.D.

ι'. Ἡ μία, ἁγία, καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία τῶν ἑπτὰ Οἰκουμενικῶν Συνόδων παρεδέχετο, ὅτι τὰ τίμια δῶρα καθαγιάζονται μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος διὰ τῆς εὐλογίας τοῦ ἱερέως, ὡς μαρτυροῦσι τὰ ἀρχαῖα τυπικὰ τῆς Ῥώμης καὶ τῶν Γαλλιῶν, ὕστερον ὅμως ἐκαινοτόμησε καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἡ παπικὴ Ἐκκλησία, ἀποδεξαμένη αὐθαιρέτως τὴν καθαγίασιν τῶν τιμίων δώρων ὡς γινομένην σὺν τῇ ἐκφωνήσει τῶν Κυριακῶν λο-

γίων· "Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου·" καί, "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου."

P. 32.

ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΙΕΡΩΝ ΤΕΛΕΤΩΝ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας, . . . ὑπὸ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΠΕΡΣΙΔΟΥ. Ἔκδοσις δευτέρα. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1903

Ἐρ. Πότε τελεῖται τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου;

Ἀπ. Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου τελεῖται, ὁπότε, μετὰ τὴν ἐκφώνησιν τῶν λόγων τῶν ῥηθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς συστάσεως τοῦ μυστηρίου "Λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν." "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς Διαθήκης, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν," καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐκφώνησιν "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρομεν κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα," ὁ ἱερουργῶν ἐπικαλεῖται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον καὶ εὐλογεῖ τὰ ἅγια δῶρα.

P. 70.

Missale Richenovense

Lateinische und Griechische Messen aus dem zweiten bis sechsten Jahrhundert. Herausgegeben von Franz Joseph Mone. Frankfurt am Main, 1850.

(1)

p. 18. Domini ac dei nostri sempeterni gloriam depraecemur. orantis uti hoc sacrificium tua benedictione. benedicas et sancti spiritus tui rore perfundas. ut accipientibus universis. legitima sit eucharestia per Jhm Xpm filium tuum deum ac dominum conservatoremque nostrum. cui est aput te domine cum spiritum sanctum regnum sempiternum perpetua divinitas in secula seculorum amen.

(2)

p. 21. Recolentes igitur. et servantes praecepta unigeniti. depraecamur pater omnipotens. ut his creaturis

altario tuo superpositis spiritus sanctificationis infundas, ut per transfusione caelestis. adque invisibilis sacramenti. panis hic mutatur, in carne, et calex translatus in sanguine, sit totius gratia, sit sumentibus medicina. p. d.

(3)

pp. 23–24. Collectio. Deus Abraham. deus Isaac. deus Jacob deus et pater domini nostri Ihu Xpi tu de caelis tuis. propitius affavens. hoc sacrificum nostrum. indullentissima pietate prosequere. discendat domine plenitudo. magistatis. divinitatis, pietatis. virtutis, benedictionibus et gloriae tuae. super hunc panem. et super hunc calicem. et fiat nobis. legitima eucharistia in transformatione corporis et sanguinis domini. ut quicumque et cotienscumque ex hoc panem. et ex hoc calice libaberimus. sumamus nobis. monimentum, fidei. sincerem dilectiones. tranquilla. spem resurrectionis. adque inmortalitatis aeterne in tuo filique tui. hac

(4)

pp. 26–27. Post Secreta. Addit etiam istud edictum. ut quotienscumque corpus ipsius sumeretur. et sanguis. commemoratio fierit dominicae passionis, quod nos facientis Jhesu Christi fili tui domini ac dei nostri. semper gloriam praedicamus, rogamus uti hoc sacrificium tua benedictione benedicas et sancti spiritus rore perfundas, ut accipientibus universis. sit eucharia pura vera legitima, per Jhesum Christum filium tuum dominum ac deum nostrum qui vivet et regnat tecum cum spirito sancto in aeterna saecula saeculorum amen

Missale Gothicum

Muratori, Liturgia Romana Vetus, ii., cols. 517–658

(1)

Post Secreta (in Circumcisione Domini nostri Jesu Christi). Col. 534.

Haec nos, Domine, instituta et praecepta retinentes, suppliciter oramus: uti hoc sacrificium suscipere, et benedicere, et sanctificare digneris: ut fiat nobis eucharistia legitima in tuo, Filiique tui nomine, et Spiritus Sancti, in transformationem corporis ac sanguinis Domini Dei nostri Jesu Christi Unigeniti tui. Per quem omnia creas, creata benedicis, benedicta sanctificas, et sanctificata largiris Deus, qui in trinitate perfecta vivis et regnas in saecula saeculorum.

(2)

Post Mysterium (in Adsumptione S. Mariae Matris Domini nostri). Col. 548.

Descendat, Domine, in his sacrificiis tuae benedictionis coaeternus et cooperator Paraclytus Spiritus: ut oblationem, quam tibi de tua terra fructificante porregimus, caelesti permuneratione, te sanctificante, sumamus: ut translata fruge in corpore, calice in cruore, proficiat meritis, quod obtulimus pro delictis. Praesta, omnipotens Deus, qui vivis et regnas in saec.

(3)

Post Mysterium (in Cathedra Sancti Petri Apostoli). Cols. 565–566.

Haec igitur praecepta sevantes, sacrosancta munera nostrae salutis offerimus, obsecrantes: ut immiscere digneris Spiritum tuum Sanctum supra haec solemnia: ut fiat nobis legitima eucharistia in tuo, Filiique tui nomine, et Spiritus Sancti, in transformatione corporis ac sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi Unigeniti tui, edentibus nobis vitam aeternam, regnumque perpetuum conlatura bibituris. Per ipsum Dominum.

(4)

Missa (in Coena Domini). Cols. 577–578.

Sacrosanctam, fratres dilectissimi, hodierna die inchoandae Paschae solemnitatem, ac salutiferam Dominicae

immolationem effigiem in sacrificio spiritali, Christo offerente, transfusam, non jam in amaritudinem azymi, neque in fermento veteris malitiae celebrantes; sed in novam et sinceram consparsionem, immaculatas sacris altaribus hostias offerentes; omnipotentem Deum per Unigenitum Filium suum Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum deprecemur; qui haec in sacri corporis et sanguinis sui oblatione benedicere et sanctificare dignatus est; ita offerentium famulorum suorum munera oblata benedicat; et per inlustratione Spiritus Sancti, deferentibus nuntiis, odor suavitas ascendat. Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Fil.

(5)

Post Sanctus (in Vigiliis Sanctae Paschae). Col. 594.

Tuo jusso, Domine, condita sunt universa in caelo et in terra, in mari et in omnibus abyssis. Tibi patriarchae, prophetae, apostoli, martyres, confessores, atque omnes sancti gratias agunt: quod et nos facientes, has hostias spiritales, et sincera libamina, ut libens exaudias, deprecamur, Te oramus: uti hoc sacrificium tua benedictione benedicas; et Spiritus Sancti tui rore perfundas: ut sit omnibus legitima eucharistia. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Qui pridie.

(6)

Post Secreta (Missa Sancti Leudegarii Martyris). Col. 637.

Haec facimus, Domine, passionem tuam commemorantes. Haec facimus, Pater Jesu Christe: qui nobis de lege veteri novam tradidisti. Concede nobis, intercedente Beato antistite Leudegario Martyre, cujus hodie annuae commemoratione celebramus: ut descendat hic benedictio tua super hunc panem et calicem in transformatione Spiritus tui Sancti; uti haec benedicendo benedicas, sanctificando sanctifices: ut quicunque ex utraque bene-

dictione sumpserimus, aeternitatis praemium, et vitam consequi mereamur aeternam. Per.

(7)

Post Mysterium (Missa Dominicalis). Col. 651.

Magnum hoc munus misericordiae est: qui nobis docuit redemptionis nostrae sacrificia celebrare, sicut obtulit Dominus noster Jesus Christus in terris. Per quem te, Pater omnipotens, deprecamur: ut supraposita altario tuo munera laetus aspicias: atque haec omnia obumbres Sancti Filii tui Spiritus: ut quod ex hac tua benedictione acceperimus, aeternitatis gloria consequamur. Per.

(8)

Post Secreta (Missa Dominicalis). Col. 654.

Memores gloriosissimi Domini passionis et ab inferis resurrectionis, offerimus tibi, Domine, hanc immaculatam hostiam, rationalem hostiam, incruentem hostiam, hunc panem sanctum, et calicem salutarem, obsecrantes: ut infundere digneris Spiritum tuum Sanctum: edentibus nobis vitam aeternam, regnumque perpetuum conlatura potantibus. Per.

Missale Gallicanum Vetus

Muratori, Liturgia Romana Vetus, ii., col. 698–758

(1)

Post Secreta (Missa S. Germani Episcopi). Col. 699–700.

Descendat, precamur omnipotens Deus, supplices haec, quae tibi offerimus Verbum tuum sanctum; descendat in[ae]stimabilis gloriae tuae Spiritus; descendat antiquae indulgentiae tuae donum: ut fiat oblatio nostra hostia spiritalis [in] odorem suavitatis accepta: etiam nos famulos tuos per sanguinem Christi tua manus dextera invicta custodiat. Per Dominum.

(2)

Collectio post Secreta (de Adventu Domini nostri Jesu Christi). Col. 705.

Descendat, precamur, omnipotens Deus, super haec, quae tibi offerimus, Verbum tuum sanctum; descendat in[ae] stimabilis gloriae tuae Spiritus; descendat antiquae indulgentiae tuae donum: ut fiat oblatio haec hostia spiritalis in odorem suavitatis accepta: etiam nos famulos tuos per sanguinem Christi tua manus invicta custodiat. Per Dominum.

(3)

Post Secreta (Missa in Symboli Traditione). Col. 719.

Aspice sincero vultu pie miserator haec munera; qui semper es propensus ad dona: ut ipsa contemplatione oblata sanctifices naturali Majestate; qui perpetue sanctus es, et sancta largiris. Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum filium tuum.

Cf. Missale Gothicum, *Ibid.*, col. 577.

Mozarabic Missal

Migne, P. L. lxxxv.

Post Sanctus. Vere sanctus . . . ipse Dominus et redemptor eternus. *Deinde dicat Presb. in silentio junctis manibus inclinando se ante altare hanc Orationem.*

Adesto adesto Jesu bone pontifex in medio nostri: sicut fuisti in medio discipulorum tuorum: sancti✠fica hanc oblationem: ✠ut sanctificata✠sumamus per manus sancti angeli tui sancte Dominus ac redemptor eterne. Dominus noster Jesus Christus in qua nocte tradebatur accepit panem: et gratias agens bene✠dixit ac fregit: deditque discipulis suis dicens. Accipite et manducate. Hoc: est: corpus: meum: quod: pro: vobis: tradetur. *Hic elevetur corpus.* Quoticscumque manducaveritis: hoc facite in meam✠commemorationem. Similiter et

calicem postquam cenavit dicens. Hic ✠ est: calix: novi: testamenti: in: meo: sanguine: qui: pro: vobis: et: pro: multis: effundetur: in: remissionem: peccatorum. *Hic elevetur calix coopertus cum filiola.* Quotiescumque biberitis hoc facite in meam commemorationem. *Et cum perventum fuerit ubi dicit.* In meam commemorationem. *Dicat presb. alta voce omnibus diebus preter festivis: pari modo ubi dicit.* In claritatem de celis. *Et qualibet vice respondeat Chorus.* Amen. Quotiescumque manducaveritis panem hunc et calicem istum biberitis: mortem Domini annunciabitis donec veniet. In claritatem ✠ de celis. *R. Chorus.* Amen.

Dicat Presb.

Post Pridie. Oratio . . . *R.* Amen. *Postea dicat presb.*

Te prestante sancte Domine: quia tu hec omnia nobis indignis servis tuis: valde bona creas: sancti✠ficas: vivificas ✠ benedi✠cis ✠ ac prestas nobis: ut sit benedicta a te Deo nostro in secula seculorum. *R. Chorus.* Amen.

Col. 116–117.

Post Pridie. (In Sancti Andree Apostoli.)

Credimus pariter et fatemur summe ac credulitatis impulsu tacere non sinimur: te Deum Redemptorem: quem nostrum pro nobis miseris in cruce fuisse suspensum. Descendisse etiam in infernum: ut nos resurgens elevares ad celos. Reliquisse etiam nobis exemplum: ut te sequentes Dominum: passiones tolleremus in mundum. quo expleto beatus Andreas discipulus tuus ac martyr et apostolus informatus: crucis pro te supplicium devota mente portavit. Fac nos quesumus Domine ipso intercedente hoc tui corporis sanguinisque mysterium Spiritus tui rore sanctificatum: ad nostrarum remedium sumere animarum. *R.* Amen. — Col. 162.

Post Pridie. (In Navitate Domini Nostri Jesu Christi.)

Hec Domine dona tua et precepta servantes: in altare tuum panis ac vini holocausta proponimus. Rogantes profussisimam tue misericordie pietatem: ut in eodem Spiritu quo te in carne virginitas incorrupta concepit: has hostias Trinitas indivisa sanctificet: ut cum a nobis fuerit non minori trepidatione quam veneratione percepta: quicquid contra animam male vivit intereat: quicquid interierat nullatenus reviviscat. *R.* Amen. — Col. 189.

N.B. This same *Post Pridie* is also assigned to St. Matthias, to St. Matthew, and to the Common of One Martyr (cols. 727, 864, 952), without essential variation. These three last omit *dona et* in the opening clause, and all that follows after *sanctificet,* and insert between *proponimus* and *rogantes* the clause: *et in commemorationem sancti tui* (*Mathie Apostoli,* or *Matthei Apostoli et Evangeliste,* or *N.* respectively) *suscepta populi tui per has oblationes te jubente vota deferimus non nostris meritis: sed obsequio suscepti officii.*

Post Pridie Oratio. (In Primo Dominico post Octavam Epiphanie Domini.)

Domine sacrificia dependentes supplices flagitamus: ut effundas in his hostiis Sancti tui Spiritus largitatem. Ut dum a te benedicta sumimus: omni nos benedictione refectos: et a criminum vinculis liberatos: omnibus modis gaudeamus. *R.* Amen. Te prestante sancte Domine: per quem tu hec omnia nobis indignis, etc. — Col. 245.

Post Pridie. (In Secundo Dominico post Octavas Epiphanie.)

Vitam nostram Domine unigeniti tui mortem votiva confessione promerentes: in resurrectionem ejus et ascensionem in celis vita indubitata fatemur: vetus quoque rursus: ac pro meritis singulos judicaturus reatu licet trepidi: sed tua freti misericordia prestolamur. Ob hoc

ergo quesumus famulantes: ut oblationem hanc Spiritus tui permixtione sanctifices: et corporis ac sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi plena transformatione conformes. Ut hostia qua nos redemptos esse meminimus: mundari a sordibus facinorum mereamur: nec nos transfixus vulnere: a tua reprobes curatione. Medicus enim es: egri sumus. Misericors es: nos miseri. Ergo qui tibi nostra non abscondimus vulnera quibus placaris: sana nos sacrificio. *R.* Amen. Presta Pater ingenite per unigenitum tuum Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum: per quem tu hec omnia nobis indignis servis, etc. — Cols. 250, 251.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Sexto Dominico post Octavas Epiphanie Domini.)

Credentes Domine universa mirabilia Domini nostri Jesu Christi filii tui: atque incarnationis ejus: et divinitatis potentiam confitentes in tuis laudibus exultamus tibique sacrificium laudis offerimus. Rogamus clementiam tuam summa Trinitas Deus et infinita majestas: ut hec oblatio quam in sancto altario tuo deferimus, pro nostrorum expiatione facinorum: sit oculis tuis placita: sit semper accepta: simulque efficiatur illo seculo superveniente septiformi Spiritu benedicta quo ubique Deus veraciter manifestetur in eo. Ut te hanc hostiam benedicente: si qui ex ea libaverint te largiente: et in hoc seculo percipiant medicinam et in futuro consequantur vite eterne coronam. *R.* Amen. — Cols. 272, 273.

Post Pridie. (Dominico Primo in Quadragesima.)

Deus qui in corde mulieris Samaritane Spiritum tue sanctificationis dedisti: quo te crederet: quo te inspirata sentiret: quo etiam posset tue majestatis potentiam fideli intentione narrare. Emitte Spiritum tuum de sanctis celis tuis: quo sanctificentur oblata: suscipiantur vota: expientur delicta: et cunctis ex hoc sumentibus

donetur criminis indulgentia: atque eterne promissionis gaudia sempiterna. *R.* Amen. — Col. 304.

Post Pridie. (In Quinto Dominico Quadragesime.)

Recitatis Domine unigeniti tui sacramentorum preceptis: simulque preclare passionis et resurrectionis et in celos ascensionis memoriam facientes majestatem tuam supplices rogamus ac petimus. Ut in his sacrificiis benedictionum tuarum plenitudo descendat: et infundas in eis imbrem Spiritus tui Sancti de celis. Ut fiat hoc sacrificium secundum ordinem Melchisedech: fiat hoc sacrificium secundum ordinem Patriarcharum et Prophetarum tuorum. Ut quod ab illis tipice facientibus unigeniti filii tui significantibus adventum: tua majestas acceptare dignata est: sic hoc sacrificium respicere et sanctificare digneris: quod est[1] verum corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi filii tui: qui pro nobis omnibus factus est Sacerdos et hostia. Hanc itaque hostiam tu piissime Pater de tue claritatis respectu sanctifica: ut sumentibus eam: et hic delictorum veniam: et eternam in celis conferas vitam. *R.* Amen. — Col. 376.

Post Pridie. (In Die Resurrectionis Domini.)

Precamur nunc Domine sancte Pater eterne omnipotens Deus: ut quemadmodum Dominus noster Jesus Christus filius tuus illa ineffabilium gratiarum actione semetipsum tibi pro nobis offerens: mortem nostram suscepturus auditus est: ita nunc et nos qui ipsum et vitam ejus querimus exequendo ministerialiter: que instituit audia-

[1] Dr. Neale regarded *quod est* as an alteration from *quod sit* or some similar phrase, such as *quod fiat*. See his *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History*, second edition, London, 1867, p. 164; and also his *Earnest Plea for the Retention of the Scotch Liturgy*, London, 1862, p. 12. Cf. Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica* (second edition), London, 1876, p. 589, note 4; pp. 649–650; pp. 651–652. But, may this not be simply an explanation of that wherein the sanctification requested for the elements consists? "That is, [to be] the true Body," etc.

mus. Ut hic tibi panis cum hoc calice oblatus in filii tuĩ corpus et sanguinem te benedicente ditescat. Ac largo oris tui perfusus Spiritu: indulgentiam nobis omnium peccatorum largiatur et gratiam: et conlate a se salutis dono: donec in semetipso perficiat: custodiam adhibeat indefessam. *R.* Amen. — Cols. 485, 486.

Post Pridie. (Secunda Feria Pasche ad Missam.)

Hoc agentes apud te Pater sancte redemptricem nostram unigeniti tui mortem: sicut ipse precepit usque in adventum ipsius nuntiamus. Nos eum pro nobis annuntiamus mortuum esse: tu commoriendi tribue dignitatem. Nos eum resurrexisse credimus: tu presta ut quotidianis nostris liberemur a lapsibus. Nos eum credimus et annuntiamus ad judicium esse venturum: tu presta talem conversationem ut ejus terribilem adventum propicium mereamur habere. Hanc quoque oblationem ut acceptam habeas et benedicas supplices exoramus: sicut accepta habuisti munera Abel pueri tui justi: et sacrificium patriarche nostri Abrahe: et quod obtulit Summus Sacerdos tuus Melchisedech. Descendat hic queso invisibiliter benedictio tua sicut quondam in patrum hostiis descendebat. Ascendat odor suavitatis in conspectu divine majestatis tue: ex hoc sublimi altario tuo per manus Angeli tui: et deferatur in ista solennia Spiritus tuus Sanctus qui tam adstantis quam offerentis populi: et oblata pariter et vota sanctificet. Ut quicumque ex hoc corpore libaverimus sumamus nobis medelam anime: ad sananda cordium vulnera: ad expellendas de cogitationibus cordis nostri omnes imagines vanitatis. Ad eradicanda funditus odia vel vicia terrena: ad plantandam perpetuam charitatem: que operit multitudinem peccatorum. Ut vere hic sanguis sacer filii tui Domini nostri ita peccata nostra diluat potatus: sicut quondam nos redemit effusus. *R.* Amen. — Cols. 491, 492.

N.B. Br. Mus. Add. MS. 30,846, fol. 7 omits *munera Abel pueri tui justi,* and inserts before *descendebat, visibiliter.*

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Octava Pasche ad Missam.)

Facimus Domine commemorationem Domini nostri Jesu Christi filii tui: qui nos morte sua redemit: et Resurrectione erexit. Quique hodie ad discipulos januis clausis intravit: et uni eorum hesitanti: corporea attrectatione se palpandum exhibuit. Unde per ipsum te Deus Pater exposcimus: ut illo Spiritu hec oblata sanctifices: quo olim in discipulos insufflasti credentes. Sicque nos participatione hostie hujus percipiamus meritum sanctitatis: sicut illi te insufflante adepti sunt verbum predicationis. *R.* Amen. — Col. 574.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Ascensione Domini.)

Indicavimus plane: nec unquam tacebimus passum te Christe pro redemptione miserorum: resurrexisse pro salute fidelium: celos ascendisse pro virtute meritorum: venturum te esse Judicem mortuorum atque viventium. Quod scientes Domine: ut nobis dies illa terribilis aliquantulum ex tua propitiatione mitior adveniat: hec munera offerimus. Que ut nobis in salutem percepta contingant: visitet ea Spiritus tuus Sanctus qui in similitudinem flamme manus [= Manue] dona suscepit. Visitet et vivificet ea Spiritus tuus Sanctus: qui per vaporem incendii Helie prophete holocaustum adsumpsit. Visitet et vivificet ea Spiritus tuus Sanctus: qui ignearum divisione linguarum in Apostolorum tuorum cordibus commeavit. Ut recepta in visceribus nostris: et presentem nobis: et eternam prestent salutem. *R. Chorus.* Amen. — Cols. 604, 605.

N.B. Br. Mus. Add. MS. 30, 844, fol. 137 v. adds *supplices deprecamur* after *contingant*.

N.B. Br. Mus. Add. MS. 30,846 contains this *Post Pridie* twice, fol. 108 v/109 v and fol. 119 v/120 v. In the first instance it ends with *contingant* (the rest being understood). In the second instance it is given entire, *rogamus* being added between *contingant* and *visitet*.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Dominico post Ascensionem Domini.)

Contueri tuam Christe cupientes presentiam: qui humana non deserens: appetisti superna: petimus et rogamus: ut qui pignus assumpte carnis intulisti in celos: consolationem nobis Sancti Spiritus largiaris. Cujus nunc presentia et apposita hec tibi oblata sanctifices: et nostrorum cordium arcana perlustres. *R.* Amen. — Col. 608.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Vigilia Pentecostes.)

Spiritus Sancte qui a Patre et Filio procedis: his propicius inlabere holocaustis. Quo qui a Patre es repromissus: sanctificationem humanis exhibeas presentatus: repleasque sponsionis mercede: quos te promissum inspicis expectare. *R.* Amen. — Col. 612.

N.B. Br. Mus. Add. MS. 30,846, fol. 161 r/163 r. adds *cordibus* after *humanis*.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Die Sancto Pentecostes.)

Suscipe quesumus Spiritus Sancte omnipotens Deus sacrificia te auctore instituente decreta: qui inlibate Virginis in utero quondam membra: in qua Verbum caro fieret: quibus hoc rite sacrificium competeret immaculata formasti. In cujus hec similitudinem corporis et sanguinis munera ingerimus: et ut plenitudinem debite sanctificationis te deificante obtineant supplicamus. Quia tu vere ille ignis es: qui patrum nostrorum acceptans sacrificia divinitus consumpsisti. Quemadmodum Helie quoque victimam aquis circumfluentibus natitatem cum lapidibus et lignis exurens: etiam madefacti pulveris rivulos calore inconsummabili arefactos inextimabiliter absumendo finisti. Simili nunc quesumus has hostias dignatione suscipias: divinitatis tue igne salvifico omnium pectorum nostrorum affectionem exurens: atque ad percipiendam celestis cibi potusque substantiam vivificans corda mortalium: in et custodiam nostri deputans sanctorum multitudinem Angelorum: nunquam nos eorum privari consortio patiaris. *R.* Amen. — Col. 620.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In festo Sancte Marciane Virginis et Martyris.)

Te omnipotens Deus petimus et rogamus: ut hanc oblationem quam tibi fideli et humili devotione offerimus: suscipere digneris propicius: et nostre servitutis libamina ipse tibi facias acceptabilia. Ut accepta per mysterium Sancti Spiritus: nobis sanctificata tribuas postulatione nostre salutis: et in odorem suavitatis accipias. *R.* Amen. — Col. 778.

N.B. This same *Post Pridie* is also found in the mass of St. Rufina (col. 787) with slight differences: *e.g.*, *ministerium* for *mysterium*, and *postulationem* for *postulatione*.

Post Pridie. (In sancte Christine Virginis et Martyris.)

Hec igitur precepta servantes: sacrosancta munera nostre salutis offerimus: obsecrantes te clementissime omnipotens Deus: ut infundere digneris Spiritum tuum Sanctum super hec libamina: ut fiat nobis legitima Eucharistia: in te filiique tui nomine: et Spiritus Sancti benedicta: in transformatione ejusdem corporis Domini nostri Jesu Christi filii tui edentibus nobis in vitam eternam regnumque perpetuum. *R.* Amen. — Col. 794.

Post Pridie. (In festo Apostolorum Symonis et Jude.)

Amator et conservator Sanctorum omnipotens Pater: ecce super altare tuum in honorem Sanctorum apostolorum Simonis et Jude: panis ac vini ab unigenito tuo Domino nostro holocausta instituta proponimus: eaque Sancti Spiritus rore perfunde deposcimus. Dignetur quesumus super illa inlabi Spiritus Sanctus: dignetur illa sanctificata suscipere illorum institutor: tuus unigenitus filius. Ut quotquot ex illis libaverimus: non pro presumptione sustineamus vindictam, sed pro voto perfrui mereamur corona. Qualiter Christi Domini nostri filii tui perceptis sacrificiis communicantes: ad conspectum glorie tue perveniamus indemnes. *R.* Amen. — Col. 891.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Festo Corporis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.)

Complentes igitur atque servantes preceptum Unigeniti tui: precamur omnipotens Pater: ut his creaturis superpositis altario tuo Spiritum sanctificationis infundas: ut per transfusionem celestis atque invisibilis Sacramenti panis: hic transmutatus in carnem: et calix transformatus in sanguinem: sit offerentibus gratia: sumentibus medicina. *R.* Amen. — Col. 627.

N.B. The *Post Pridie* In Dominico ante Jejunium Kalendarum Novembrium (col. 650) is the same, except that it reads *precepta* instead of *preceptum*, and *munus infundas* instead of *spiritum infundas*.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Sancte Eulalie Virginis et Martyris Barchinonensis.)

Omnipotens Deus: qui inlibatum Virginis corpus intactum servas a flammis: emitte in his hostiis Spiritum sanctitatis. Qui et oblata sanctificet: et oblatores propiciabili respectu perlustret. *R.* Amen. — Col. 713.

Post Pridie. (In festo Sanctorum Fructuosi: Agurii: et Eulogii Martyrum et ejus comitum.)

Omnipotens Deus. . . . Tu hec oblata tibi libamina calore Sancti Spiritus perflans: benedicenda assume: horumque participatione fac nos charitate fervere: delictisque frigescere. Quo in divino amore succensi: sit in nobis ignis: qui exurat peccata: non qui augeat viciorum carnalium incentiva. *R.* Amen. — Col. 717.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In festo SS. Torquati et Comitum ejus Episcoporum.)

Deus omnipotens qui ad salvandum partis nostre conventum: septem misisti specula Sacerdotum: eisdem intercedentibus quorum sacratissime memorie tuo recitantur altario: Spiritum Sanctum de tuis sedibus mitte. Quo et oblatis hostiis sanctificationem: et nostris doc-

toribus profusissimam impercias sanctitatem. *R.* Amen. — Col. 738.

N.B. Br. Mus. Add. MS. 30,846, fol. 87 r reads *nostris peccatoribus.*

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In festo Sancti Sperati: et ejus comitum.)

Mirabilem te in Sanctis tuis Domine confitentes: ac resurrectionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi gloriam predicantes: per eorum te deprecamur piissimas preces: quos in agone certaminis reddidisti victores: ut de illo invisibili ac profluo fonte: quo illi vitam eternam potare non cessant: Spiritum sanctificationis emittas: qui oblatum hoc sacrificium celesti rore pinguescere faciat. Quod dum a te Domine sumpserimus sanctificatum: tuoque munere fuerit visceribus nostris infusum: omni nos benedictione refectos: atque ab omni onere peccatorum absolutos: nos semper sentiamus et liberos. *R.* Amen. — Col. 911.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (Missa Plurimarum Virginum.)

Sacrarum Virginum excolentes solennia: hec tibi Domine offerimus holocausta: tuam postulantes clementiam. Ut qui septus Virginum choris: inter lilia pasceris: [su]per hec libamina: Spiritum tue dirigas sanctitatis. Ut quod a nobis ob honorem Virginum tuarum N. et N. acceperis: hoc nobis sumendum ad nostrorum criminum indulgentiam largiaris. *R.* Amen. — Col. 981.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (Missa de uno Defuncto.)

Obtemperantes talibus institutis: te poscimus omnipotens Pater: ut ad sanctificationem hujus hostie spiritualis Spiritum Sanctum: quem filius tuus repromisit: immittas: ut per eum sanctificati: unius divinitatis mereamur percipere trinitatem: ut cum justus advenerit judex: eos in nobis fructus: quibus gloria preparatur: inveniat. *R.* Amen. — Col. 1025 (=Liber Ordinum, col. 430, with slight variations).

Post Sanctus. (In Tertio Dominico post Pentecosten.)

Vere sanctus: vere benedictus Dominus noster Jesus Christus filius tuus. In cujus nomine etiam tibi Domine hec sacra libamus: orantes: ut que offerimus libens suscipias: et Spiritus tui Sancti infusione benedicas. Deus Dominus ac redemptor eternus.

Post Pridie. Oratio.

Benedic Domine huic hostie in honorem tui nominis tibi oblate: et sumentium ex ea sanctifica mentem: et purifica voluntatem. *R.* Amen. — Col. 633.

Inlatio. (In Festo Sanctorum Fausti, Januarii, et Marcialis.)

. . . Dignum majestati tue laudis sacrificium offerentes: sanctificetur quesumus holocaustum tuo altario impositum: per signum filii tui: per descensum Spiritus Sancti: per presentiam Angeli[1] deputati. Sit tibi acceptum. Sit tibi gratum. Sit tibi sanctum. Venerabile gloriosum et pingue et vivum vitale et igneum. Unicuique nostrum cum degustaverimus: carbo igneus efficiatur: quem vidit Esayas propheta Angelica manu: forcipe abstractum ab ara: labia nostra mundet: immunda polluta peccatis nostra tibi sanctificet corda. . . .

Post Pridie. Oratio.

Indivisa Trinitas et una majestas: que predictorum Martyrum hodie in passione laudaris: et presentium sacrificiorum litatione placanda ascisceris: te vocibus: votis: et orationibus imploramus: ut que illis inexpugnabilem tribuisti devicto hoste victoriam: hec nostra sanctifices propiciata oblata. *R. Chorus.* Amen. — Cols. 873, 874.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (Nativitas Sancte Johannis Baptiste.)

[1] Cf. *Canon Missae,* ¶ I, p. 361.

Convaluisti: Domine Jesu Christe in gratia: et incredulis gentibus sedula testatione claruisti. . . . Oramus ergo te Domine ut hanc oblationem nostram: respicere et benedicere digneris: sicut benedicere dignatus es munus Abel justi pueri tui.[1] *R.* Amen. Cols. 761, 762.

N.B. Is this complete? Compare the *Post Pridie* of Easter Monday, col. 491. (See above, p. 344.)

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Quinto Dominico Pasche.)

Confitemur Domine confitemur: et credimus pro nostro scelere te corporaliter mortis subiisse supplicium: et pro omnium salute prostrato mortis interitu triumphantibus Angelis celestem Patris: ex qua veneras: ad mansionem reversum. Pro quo te Deus omnipotens rogamus et petimus: ut oblata in conspectu tuo nostre servitutis libamina: ipse tibi acceptabilia facias: et accepta discurrente sancto Angelo tuo [2] nobis sanctificata distribuas: ut dum corda nostra corporis et sanguinis filii tui Domini nostri commixtione purificas: petitiones nostras in odorem suavitatis accipias. *R.* Amen. Cols. 590, 591.

Inlatio. (Item Missam pro se ipso sacerdote.)

. . . Placita tibi sunt hec sacrificia; eaque manu Angeli tui: [2] ipse sanctifica. . . .

Post Sanctus.

. . . Infusione Sancti Spiritus tui repleantur munera hujus sacrificii. Tu es Deus meus salvator: et redemptor eterne.

Post Pridie. Oratio.

Hec hostia panis ac vini: que a me indigno tuo sunt imposita altario: regalibus sedibus tuis eterne omnipotens Deus intuere vultu placabili: et benedic per manus Angeli gloriosi.[2] . . . Ut sanatus per gratiam

[1] Cf. *Canon Missae*, ¶ H, pp. 360–361.
[2] Cf. *Canon Missae*, ¶ I, p. 361.

tuam merear tibi laudes persolvere placitas. *R.* Amen. Cols. 989, 990.

N.B. Liber Ordinum (cols. 278, 279) gives these with but slight variation.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (Missa de omnibus Fidelibus Defunctis.)

Credimus te Domine Jesu Christe omnium esse virtutum: rogamus te Deus piissime: ut precem nostram jubeas exaudiri propicius: et omnibus in te credentibus peccata jubeas dimitti: et hujus sacrificii munera per manus Angeli tui [1] jubeas sanctificari. Defunctorum quoque famulorum tuorum N. et N. qui in te credentes ab hac necesserunt luce: locum tribue electorum in regione vivorum. *R.* Amen. Col. 1031 (= Liber Ordinum, col. 428, with slight variations).

Post Pridie. Oratio. (In Sexto Dominico Pasche.)

Hec est pia et salutaris hostia Deus Pater: qua tibi reconciliatus est mundus [2] Hoc est corpus illud: quod pependit in cruce. Hic etiam sanguis: qui sacro profluxit ex latere.[2] Pietati tue proinde gratias agentes: ex hoc quod nos filii tui morte redemeris: et Resurrectione salvaveris: acclives mente te Dominum pietatis oramus: ut hec libamina: Spiritus tui sancti benedictione respergens: sumentium visceribus sanctificationem accommodes. Quo purificati a criminum labe plenissime jocundemur in hoc Resurrectionis Dominice die. *R.* Amen. Col. 597.

Post Pridie. (Feria Tertia post Pascha.)

Paschalium gaudiorum deliciis delectati: offerimus tibi Domine sancte Pater [2] corpus et sanguinem filii tui: [2]

[1] Cf. *Canon Missae*, ¶ I., p. 361.

[2–2] These expressions seem to suggest the modern Roman theory of consecration. They may be alterations or additions to the earlier text (cf. p. 343, note 1). On the other hand, they may be simply rhetorical equivalents of the phrase *imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis* of a *Post Pridie* in the *Liber Ordinum* (cols 321–322), given below, p. 357.

quod ipse placatus benedicendum assumens: largiaris nobis quesumus cum regeneratis infantibus conscientie puritatem ita habere dum vivimus: ut ex hoc post vite hujus excursum cum eisdem a te pariter coronemur. quo omnes qui nunc tue resurrectionis victorias ovando excolimus: in resurrectionis ultimo die: in hujus hostie litatione salvemur. *R.* Amen. Col. 497.

Post Sanctus. (Feria Quarta Pasche.)

. . . Et tu tanto noti splendoris candore perfusus: sacrificia per te instituta sanctifica. Non invocantis merito: sed instituentis magisterio vel exemplo. . . .

Post Pridie. Oratio.

Resurgente Christo resolutis inferni doloribus: etiam nos Deus Pater omnipotens solutis peccatorum delectationibus et resurgere concede propicius: ut mortificationis nostre sacrificium tibi principaliter offeramus. Reconciliet te quesumus Domine pro peccatoribus sanguis justi et humilitas Domini nostri. [1] Hec est hostia que pependit in ligno. Hec est caro que surrexit de sepulcro.[1] Quod pro nobis obtulit Sacerdos noster: in veritate hoc conferimus in panis et vini suavitate. Cognosce precamur omnipotens Deus victimam: qua intercedente placatus es: et suscipe in adoptionem: quibus Pater per gratiam factus es. Sic quoque Domine sanctificatio et benedictio tua: defensio est et mundatio nostra. Ut et peccatorum nobis veniam tribuas: et preceptis tuis semper obedientes efficias. *R.* Amen. Cols. 501, 502.

Post Pridie. Oratio. (Missa votiva singularis.)

Recolentes Domine sancte Pater eterne omnipotens Deus: preceptis tuis precamur inclitam tue clementie majestatem: et mysterium passionis Jesu Christi filii tui Domini nostri: ut [1] hic panis: quem lignum crucis: coxit: et hic calix: quem torcular passionis expressit:[1] bene-

[1–1] Cf. second note on preceding page.

dictionem tue divinitatis accipiant: veramque salutem sumentibus prestent: ut quicumque exinde sumpserimus: specialem gratiam consequi mereamur. *R.* Amen. Col. 993.

N.B. Liber Ordinum (cols. 317–318) inserts *per* before *mysterium.*

Post Pridie. (In festo Inventionis Sancte Crucis.)

Meminimus quidem omnipotens Pater: et fideli mente retinemus Domini nostri Jesu Christi filii tui: traditum nobis navitatis ejus innenarrabile sacramentum: preclarum devicta per Crucem morte triumphum: atque gloriosum ad celos post Crucis passionem ascensum. Credimus etiam immensum et incomprehensibile consempiternum tecum ejus et consubstantiale principium: ipsum quoque venturum confitemur judicem mortuorum atque viventium. Unde quesumus tremende clementissime Pater: ut hanc hostiam in similitudinem corporis et sanguinis ejus tibi oblatam: per signum Crucis sanctifices: et benedicas: in signum Crucis suscipias et adsumas: nobisque famulis tuis ejusdem Crucis vexillo prenotatis placatus distribuas: et benignus impercias. *R.* Amen. Col. 744.

N.B. Br. Mus. Add. MS. 30,846, fol. 102 v–103 v, omits *in signum Crucis suscipias.*

The Mozarabic Liber Ordinum

Edited from eleventh century MSS. by Dom M. Férotin. Paris, 1904

Missa omnimoda. (Col. 233 seq.)

Post Sanctus

Pro sexta exhinc accedit confirmatio sacramenti, ut oblatio, que Deo offertur, sanctificata per Spiritum Sanctum, Christi corpori ac sanguini conformetur.

Vere sanctus, vere benedictus es tu, Filius Dei vivi. . . . Christe Domine ac redemtor eterne.

Missa secreta.

Dominus noster Ihesus Christus, in qua nocte tradebatur accepit panem et benedixit, et gratias egit ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens: Accipite et manducate: Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. Hoc facite in meam commemora✠tionem.

Similiter et calicem, postquam cenavit, dicens: Hic calix novum testamentum est, quod pro multis effundetur in remissione peccatorum. Et hoc facite quotienscumque biberitis, in meam commemora✠tionem. Quotienscumque manducaveritis panem hunc et calicem istum biberitis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis donec veniat in clarita✠te de celis.

Resp: Sic credimus, Domine Ihesu.

Post Pridie

Sanctifica, Domine, hec tibi sacrificia delibata, et sumentium corda pietate solita a malis omnibus placatus emunda: quo mereamur tibi Domino conplacere, et incessabiliter sine offensione servire, et eterne vite hereditatem percipere sine fine. Amen.

Te prestante, summe Deus, qui in Trinitate unus Deus gloriaris in secula seculorum. Amen. Cols. 237–239.

Post Pridie. (Missa quam sacerdos pro se dicere debeat.)

Memores sumus, eterne Deus, Pater omnipotens, gloriosissime passionis Domini nostri Ihesu Christi Filii tui, Resurrectionis etiam et ejus Ascensionis in celum. Petimus ergo Majestatem tuam, Domine, [ascendant] preces humilitatis nostre in conspectu clementie, et descendat super hunc panem et super hunc calicem plenitudo tue divinitatis. Descendat etiam, Domine, illa Sancti Spiritus tui inconprehensibilis majestas, sicut quondam in Patrum hostiis mirabiliter descendebat. Ac presta, Domine, ut hujus panis vinique substantia sanis custodiam adhibeat, languentibus medicinam infundat: discordanti-

bus insinuet reconciliationem, et supereminentem pacis augeat karitatem. Stultis infundat sapientiam, et sapientibus ne extollantur tribuat disciplinam; omnibusque ad te confugium facientibus plenissimam conferat sospitatem, et regni celestis plebem tuam faciat coheredem. Amen. Col. 265.

Post Pridie. (Alia Missa quam sacerdos pro se dicere debeat.)

Recolentes Domini nostri Ihesu Christi beatissimam passionem, necnon et ab inferis resurrectionem, sed et in celis ascensionem, offerimus preclare Majestati tue hostiam panis et vini: quam sereno vultu respicias et acceptam eam habere jubeas. Descendat itaque super hoc Spiritus tuus Sanctus altare, qui et munera populi tui sanctificet, et sumentium corda placatus emundet. Col. 269.

Post Pridie. (Alia Missa singularis.)

Te, omnipotens Deus, petimus et rogamus, ut oblationem hanc, quam tibi offerimus pro famulo tuo, suscipere digneris propitius et ejus oblationes libamina ipse tibi facias acceptabilia: ut accepta per misterium Spiritus Sancti nobis sanctificata distribuas; ut, dum corda nostra Christi corporis sanctificatione purificas, et preces nostras exaudias, et holocaustum nostrum in odorem suavitatis accipias. Col. 311.

N.B. This *Post Pridie* is found again in col. 329 with the following variations: *propter famulos tuos referimus* instead of *offerimus pro famulo tuo; eorum libamina* instead of *ejus oblationes libamina;* and *ut per Spiritum tuum Sanctum sanctifices, et corda simul et corpora a peccatis expurges* instead of *ut accepta per misterium Spiritus Sancti nobis sanctificata distribuas.*

Post Pridie. (Alia Missa pluralis pro eis qui in natalicia Martirum vota sua Domino offerunt.)

Credimus, Domine sancte, Pater eterne, omnipotens Deus, Ihesum Christum Filium tuum Dominum nostrum

pro nostra salute incarnatum fuisse, et in substantia deitatis tibi semper esse equalem. Per quem, te petimus et rogamus, omnipotens Pater, ut accepta habeas et benedicere digneris hec munera et hec sacrificia inlibata, que tibi in primis offerimus pro tua sancta Ecclesia catholica, quam pacificare digneris per universum orbem terrarum in tua pace diffusam. Memorare etiam, quesumus Domine, servorum tuorum, qui tibi in honore sanctorum tuorum *Illorum* reddunt vota sua Deo vivo ac vero, pro remissione suorum omnium delictorum. Quorum oblationem benedictam, ratam rationabilemque facere digneris; que est imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Ihesu Christi Filii tui ac Redemtoris nostri. Cols. 321–322.

Post Pridie. (De Energumeno.)

Offerimus tibi, Domine, has hostias corporis et sanguinis Filii tui Domini nostri, pro redemtione animarum nostrarum: rogantes misericordiam tuam, ut sanitatem inpertire digneris famulo tuo *Illi*, quem egritudo horribilis coarctat et violentia spirituum inmundorum depopulat. Ob hoc, te Dominum omnium dominatorem supplices deprecamur, ut de sede Majestatis tue virtutem Sancti Spiritus summa velocitate transmittere digneris super hoc tibi preparatum altare, et hunc panem et hunc calicem benedicendo ✠ benedicas ✠ et sanctificando sanctifices ✠: quatenus ubi hec sacramenta ingressa fuerint, confestim omnis legio et venena seva demoniorum omnisque exercitus diaboli et immundi spiritus temtamenta, tremens gemensque discedat et imperio tuo fugam arripiat; nullam deinceps potestatem accipientes in humano genere ingrediendi, sed exteriores tenebras et penas quas merentur accipiant, Christum ubique pertimescant, signum vero sancte crucis metuant et pavescant. Col. 370.

Post Sanctus. (Missa pro his qui causas Ecclesie exsequuntur.)

Sanctus et sanctificatorum, Christe Deus et Domine, intende oblationi: et deprecationi nostre infusus, atque sic panem hunc et calicem tuus benedicat consocius cum Patre Deo Spiritus Sanctus, ut sumentibus sic fortitudo permaneas adversus malignas obpugnationes, ut famulo tuo, pro quo offertur, proveniat ad glorie palmam et triumphi victoriam. Col. 248.

[Post Pridie], Feria quinta in Coena Domini. (Bibl. Ambrosiana A 24 bis inf., end of ninth or beginning of tenth century,) Ambrosian Sacramentary.

Haec enim facimus, haec celebramus, tua Domine precepta servantes et ad communionem inviolabilem hoc ipsum quod corpus Domini sumimus mortem dominicam nuntiamus. Tuum vero est omnipotens Pater, mittere nunc nobis unigenitum Filium tuum, quem non quaerentibus sponte misisti, qui cum sis ipse immensus et inaestimabilis, Deum quoque ex te immensum et inaestimabilem genuisti, ut cujus passionem redemptionem humani generis tribuisti, ejus nunc corpus tribuas ad salutem, per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum, per quem haec omnia Domine semper bona creas ✠ sanctificas ✠ vivificas ✠ benedicis et nobis famulis tuis largiter praestas ad augmentum fidei et remissionem omnium peccatorum nostrorum; et est tibi Deo Patri omnipotenti ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso omnis honor, virtus, laus et gloria, imperium, perpetuitas et potestas in unitate Spiritus Sancti per infinita saecula saeculorum. Amen. Ebner, p. 75.

Text of the Canon Missae

(Beginning with the prayer "*Te igitur*"), from the Gelasian Sacramentary (Vatican MS. *Reginae*, 316), as given by the Rev. H. A. Wilson, M. A., in his edition, Oxford, 1894, pp. 234–236.

N.B. The arrangement into paragraphs, and the numbering of each word, is added here for purposes of reference.

A. Te [1] igitur [2] clementissime [3] Pater [4] per [5] Iesum [6] Christum [7] Filium [8] tuum [9] Dominum [10] nostrum [11] supplices [12] rogamus [13] et [14] petimus [15] uti [16] accepta [17] habeas [18] et [19] benedicas [20] haec [21] dona,[22] haec [23] munera,[24] haec [25] sancta [26] sacrificia [27] illibata.[28] Inprimis [29] quae [30] tibi [31] offerimus [32] pro [33] ecclesia [34] tua [35] sancta [36] catholica,[37] quam [38] pacificare,[39] custodire,[40] adunare [41] et [42] regere [43] digneris [44] toto [45] orbe [46] terrarum,[47] una [48] cum [49] famulo [50] tuo [51] papa [52] nostro [53] *Illo* [54] et [55] antistite [56] nostro [57] *Illo* [58] episcopo.[59]

B. Memento,[1] Domine,[2] famulorum [3] famularumque [4] tuarum,[5] et [6] omnium [7] circumadstantium,[8] quorum [9] tibi [10] fides [11] cognita [12] est,[13] et [14] nota [15] devotio,[16] qui [17] tibi [18] offerunt [19] hoc [20] sacrificium [21] laudis [22] pro [23] se [24] suisque [25] omnibus,[26] pro [27] redemptione [28] animarum [29] suarum,[30] pro [31] spe [32] salutis [33] et [34] incolumitatis [35] suae,[36] tibi [37] reddunt [38] vota [39] sua [40] aeterno [41] Deo [42] vero [43] et [44] vivo.[45]

C. Communicantes [1] et [2] memoriam [3] venerantes [4] inprimis [5] gloriosae [6] semperque [7] virginis [8] Mariae [9] genitricis [10] Dei [11] et [12] Domini [13] nostri [14] Iesu [15] Christi,[16] sed [17] et [18] beatorum [19] apostolorum [20] ac [21] martyrum [22] tuorum [23] Petri [24] et [25] Pauli,[26] Andreae,[27] Iacobi,[28] Ioannis,[29] Thomae,[30] Iacobi,[31] Philippi,[32] Bartholomaei,[33] Matthaei,[34] Simonis [35] et [36] Thaddaei,[37] Lini,[38] Cleti,[39] Clementis,[40] Xysti,[41] Cornelii,[42] Cypriani,[43] Laurentii,[44] Chrysogoni,[45] Ioannis [46] et [47] Pauli,[48] Cosmae [49] et [50] Damiani,[51] [Dionysii,[52] Rustici,[53]] et [54] Eleutherii,[55] [Hilarii,[56] Martini,[57] Augustini,[58] Gregorii,[59] Hieronymi,[60] Benedicti [61]] et [62] omnium [63] sanctorum [64] tuorum,[65] quorum [66] meritis [67] precibusque [68] concedas [69] ut [70] in [71] omnibus [72] protectionis [73] tuae [74] muniamur [75] auxilio.[76] Per [77] Christum [78] Dominum [79] nostrum.[80]

D. Hanc [1] igitur [2] oblationem [3] servitutis [4] nostrae,[5] sed [6] et [7] cunctae [8] familiae [9] tuae,[10] quaesumus,[11] Domine,[12] ut [13]

placatus [14] accipias,[15] diesque [16] nostros [17] in [18] tua [19] pace [20] disponas,[21] atque [22] ab [23] aeterna [24] damnatione [25] nos [26] eripi [27] et [28] in [29] electorum [30] tuorum [31] iubeas [32] grege [33] numerari.[34] Per [35] Christum [36] Dominum [37] nostrum.[38]

E. Quam [1] oblationem [2] tu,[3] Deus,[4] in [5] omnibus,[6] quaesumus,[7] benedictam,[8] adscriptam,[9] ratam,[10] rationabilem,[11] acceptabilemque [12] facere [13] digneris,[14] ut [15] nobis [16] corpus [17] et [18] sanguis [19] fiat [20] dilectissimi [21] Filii [22] tui [23] Domini [24] Dei [25] nostri [26] Iesu [27] Christi.[28]

F. Qui [1] pridie [2] quam [3] pateretur [4] accepit [5] panem [6] in [7] sanctas [8] ac [9] venerabiles [10] manus [11] suas,[12] elevatis [13] oculis [14] in [15] caelum [16] ad [17] te [18] Deum [19] Patrem [20] suum [21] omnipotentem,[22] tibi [23] gratias [24] agens,[25] benedixit,[26] fregit,[27] dedit [28] discipulis [29] suis,[30] dicens,[31] Accipite [32] et [33] manducate [34] ex [35] hoc [36] omnes.[37] Hoc [38] est [39] enim [40] corpus [41] meum.[42] Simili [43] modo,[44] posteaquam [45] coenatum [46] est,[47] accipiens [48] et [49] hunc [50] praeclarum [51] calicem [52] in [53] sanctas [54] ac [55] venerabiles [56] manus [57] suas,[58] item [59] tibi [60] gratias [61] agens,[62] benedixit,[63] dedit [64] discipulis [65] suis,[66] dicens,[67] Accipite [68] et [69] bibite [70] ex [71] eo [72] omnes: [73] hic [74] est [75] enim [76] calix [77] sanguinis [78] mei [79] novi [80] et [81] aeterni [82] testamenti,[83] mysterium [84] fidei,[85] qui [86] pro [87] vobis [88] et [89] pro [90] multis [91] effundetur [92] in [93] remissionem [94] peccatorum.[95] Haec [96] quotiescumque [97] feceritis [98] in [99] mei [100] memoriam [101] facietis.[102]

G. Unde [1] et [2] memores [3] sumus,[4] Domine,[5] nos [6] tui [7] servi,[8] sed [9] et [10] plebs [11] tua [12] sancta,[13] Christi [14] Filii [15] tui [16] Domini [17] Dei [18] nostri [19] tam [20] beatae [21] passionis [22] necnon [23] et [24] ab [25] inferis [26] resurrectionis,[27] sed [28] et [29] in [30] caelis [31] gloriosae [32] ascensionis: [33] offerimus [34] praeclarae [35] maiestati [36] tuae [37] de [38] tuis [39] donis [40] ac [41] datis [42] hostiam [43] puram,[44] hostiam [45] sanctam,[46] hostiam [47] immaculatam,[48] panem [49] sanctum [50] vitae [51] aeternae [52] et [53] calicem [54] salutis [55] perpetuae.[56]

H. Supra [1] quae [2] propitio [3] ac [4] sereno [5] vultu [6] respicere [7] digneris,[8] et [9] accepta [10] habere,[11] sicuti [12] accepta [13]

habere [14] dignatus [15] es [16] munera [17] pueri [18] tui [19] iusti [20] Abel,[21] et [22] sacrificium [23] patriarchae [24] nostri [25] Abrahae,[26] et [27] quod [28] tibi [29] obtulit [30] summus [31] sacerdos [32] tuus [33] Melchisedech,[34] sanctum [35] sacrificium,[36] immaculatam [37] hostiam.[38]

I. Supplices [1] te [2] rogamus,[3] omnipotens [4] Deus,[5] iube [6] haec [7] perferri [8] per [9] manus [10] angeli [11] tui [12] in [13] sublime [14] altare [15] tuum [16] in [17] conspectu [18] divinae [19] maiestatis [20] tuae,[21] ut [22] quotquot [23] ex [24] hac [25] altaris [26] participatione [27] sacrosanctum [28] Filii [29] tui [30] corpus [31] et [32] sanguinem [33] sumpserimus [34] omni [35] benedictione [36] caelesti [37] et [38] gratia [39] repleamur.[40] Per [41] Christum [42] Dominum [43] nostrum.[44] Amen.[45]

J. [Memento [1] etiam,[2] Domine [3] et [4] eorum [5] *nomina*,[6] qui [7] nos [8] praecesserunt [9] cum [10] signo [11] fidei [12] et [13] dormiunt [14] in [15] somno [16] pacis.[17] Ipsis,[18] Domine,[19] et [20] omnibus [21] in [22] Christo [23] quiescentibus [24] locum [25] refrigerii,[26] lucis [27] et [28] pacis [29] ut [30] indulgeas,[31] deprecamur.[32] Per [33] Christum [34] Dominum [35] nostrum.[36]]

K. Nobis [1] quoque [2] peccatoribus,[3] famulis [4] tuis,[5] de [6] multitudine [7] miserationum [8] tuarum [9] sperantibus,[10] partem [11] aliquam [12] societatis [13] donare [14] digneris [15] cum [16] tuis [17] sanctis [18] apostolis [19] et [20] martyribus, [21] cum [22] Ioanne,[23] Stephano,[24] Matthia,[25] Barnaba,[26] Ignatio,[27] Alexandro,[28] Marcellino,[29] Petro,[30] Felicitate,[31] Perpetua,[32] Agathe,[33] Lucia,[34] Agne,[35] Caecilia,[36] Anastasia [37] et [38] cum [39] omnibus [40] sanctis [41] tuis,[42] intra [43] quorum [44] nos [45] consortium [46] non [47] aestimator [48] meriti,[49] sed [50] veniae,[51] quaesumus,[52] largitor [53] admitte.[54] Per [55] Christum [56] Dominum [57] nostrum.[58]

L. Per [1] quem [2] haec [3] omnia,[4] Domine,[5] semper [6] bona [7] creas,[8] sanctificas,[9] vivificas,[10] benedicis,[11] et [12] praestas [13] nobis.[14] Per [15] ipsum,[16] et [17] cum [18] ipso,[19] et [20] in [21] ipso [22] est [23] tibi [24] Deo [25] Patri [26] omnipotenti [27] in [28] unitate [29] Spiritus [30] sancti [31] omnis [32] honor [33] et [34] gloria,[35] per [36] omnia [37] saecula [38] saeculorum.[39] Amen.[40]

N.B. In paragraph "I" (*Supplices te*) in the place of *ex hac altaris participatione*, (1) the Stowe Missal, the *Missale Francorum*, the Bergamo MS. and other old MSS. and early editions of the Ambrosian Rite, read *ex hoc altari sanctificationis;* (2) the Biasca MS. reads *ex hac altaris sanctificatione.*

Ordo Romanus I

MABILLON, Mus. Ital., ii., p. 12

16. Tunc finito offertorio, episcopi stant post Pontificem, primus in medio, deinde per ordinem, et archidiaconus a dextris episcoporum, secundus diaconus a sinistris, et ceteri per ordinem disposita acie. Et subdiaconi regionarii, finito offertorio, vadunt retro altare aspicientes ad Pontificem, ut quando dixerit, *Per omnia saecula*, aut *Dominus vobiscum*, aut *Sursum corda*, aut *Gratias*, ipsi sint ad respondendum, stantes erecti, usque dum incipiunt dicere hymnum angelicum, id est *Sanctus:* quem dum expleverint; surgit Pontifex solus, et intrat in Canonem. Episcopi vero, diaconi, subdiaconi, et presbyteri in presbyterio permanent inclinati. Et cum dixerit, *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, surgunt subdiaconi: cum dixerit, *Per quem haec omnia, Domine*, surgit archidiaconus solus. Cum dixerit, *Per ipsum et cum ipso*, levat cum offertorio calicem per ansas, et tenens exaltat illum juxta Pontificem. Pontifex autem tangit a latere calicem cum oblatis, dicens, *Per ipsum et cum ipso*, usque *Per omnia saecula saeculorum amen.* Et ponit oblationes in loco suo, et archidiaconus calicem juxta eas, dimīsso offertorio in ansis ejusdem.

Ordo Romanus II

MABILLON, Mus. Ital., ii., pp. 47–48

10. Tunc finito offertorio ordinantur presbyteri post Pontificem, et archidiaconus a dextris eorum; secundus diaconus a sinistris, et ceteri per ordinem disposita acie. Subdiaconi etiam, finito offertorio, vadunt retro altare adspicientes ad Pontificem, stantes erecti usquedum dicta

oratione super oblationes secreta, et Episcopo alta voce incipiente *Per omnia saecula saeculorum*, post salutationem et exhortationem, finita praefatione, incipiant dicere hymnum angelicum, id est *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus*, in quo bis repetitur *Hosanna*. Quae dum expleverint, surgit solus Pontifex, et tacite intrat in canonem, et diaconi et subdiaconi et presbyteri in presbyterio omnes permanent inclinati. In quo etiam canone sex ordines crucium observantur, quorum primus est, ubi dicitur, *Ut accepta habeas, et benedicas haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata*. Secundus quippe est, ubi dicitur, *Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quaesumus benedictam, adscriptam, ratam*. Tertius namque est crucis ordo, ubi narratur, *Et accipiens panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, benedixit*. Item, *Tibi gratias agens, benedixit*. Quartus, ubi subinfertur, *Hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitae aeternae, et calicem salutis perpetuae*. Quintus, ubi dicitur, *Per quem haec omnia Domine semper bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis*. Sextus quidem ordo sequitur, quando profertur, *Per ipsum, et cum ipso, et in ipso*, quando cum oblata calix tangitur. In eodem officio diaconi adhuc inclinati per ministerium acolythorum lavant manus suas. Et sacerdos quando dicit, *Supplices te rogamus*, humiliato capite, inclinat se ante altare. Et cum dixerit aperta clamans voce, *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, surgunt subdiaconi, et stant in loco, ubi ante steterunt, et sursum adspiciunt in faciem Pontificis. Cum dixerit, *Per quem haec omnia Domine*, erigit se archidiaconus solus: et cum dixerit, *Per ipsum, et cum ipso*, levat cum offertorio calicem per ansas, et tenet exaltans illum juxta Pontificem. Pontifex autem tangit e latere calicem, cum oblatis duas faciens cruces, et dicens, *Per ipsum, et cum ipso*, usque *per omnia saecula saeculorum*. Et ponit Pontifex oblationes in loco suo, et archidiaconus calicem juxta eas, dimisso offertorio in ansas ejusdem.

Ordo of St. Amand

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS. Lat. 974. Duchesne, Origines (English edition), pp. 455–480

p. 460–461. In Natale Domini sive in Aepyphania et in Sabbato sancto seu in Dominica sancta et in feria secunda, in Ascensa Domini et in Pentecosten vel in natale sancti Petri et sancti Pauli, stant episcopi post pontificem inclinato capite, presbiteri vero dextra levaque et tenet unusquisque corporale in manu sua, et dantur eis ab archidiacono oblatas duas ad unumquemque, et dicit pontifex canon ut audiatur ab eis, et sanctificantur oblaciones quas tenent, sicut et pontifex. [Diaconi vero stant] inclinato capite post episcopos et subdiaconi ante ipsum inclinato capite ad altare, usque dum dicit *Nobis quoque*. Et si isti dies solempni non sunt, dum calix ponitur supra altare, revertuntur presbiteri in presbiterio; similiter et alius clerus revertitur subtus tabula; et si dominica evenerit, presbiteri inclinato capite stant, et si cotidianis diebus, genua flectant quando inchoant *Sanctus*. Et veniunt acolithi stantes ante altare post diaconos, dextra levaque, involuti cum sindonibus. Et unus ex illis involutus de palla cum cruce sirica, tenens patenam contra pectus suum, stans primus, et alii tenentes sciffos cum fontes, alii saccula. Et dum venerit pontifex ad *omnis honor et gloria*, levat duas oblatas in manus suas, et diaconus calicem tenens et levans paululum usque dum dicit: *Per omnia saecula saeculorum, amen.*

Ordo Romanus, Besançon, France, tenth century

British Museum, MS. (Add.) 15,222

f. 27 v. Incipit ordo ecclesiastici Romanae ecclesiae vel qualiter missa celebratur.

f. 38 v. Quem dum expleverint · surgit pontifex solus et intrat in canone Episcopi vero · diaconi · subdiaconi · et presbiteri in presbiterio permanent inclinati. Et dum dixerit

nobis quoque peccatoribus surgunt subdiaconi · cum dixerit per quem hęc omnia domine surgit archdiaconus solus · cum dixerit per ipsum et cum ipso. Levat cum offertorio calicem per ansas · et tenet exaltans illud juxta pontificem. Pontifex autem tangit e latere calicem cum oblatis dicens. Per ipsum · et cum ipso · usque per omnia secula seculorum. Et ponit pontifex oblationes in loco suo. et archidiaconus calicem juxta eas. dimisso offertorio in ansas ejusdem.

Ordo Romanus, adapted for the use of Amiens. c. 1050 A.D.

British Museum, MS. (Add.) 17,004

p. 224 (f. 113v). Post cantatum autem angelicum hymnum · subdiaconi post altare ante episcopum vultu stant inclinato · donec corpus et sanguis domini consecretur et audiant. Nobis quoque peccatoribus.

Ordo Missarum

Ambrosian Library, Milan, MS. I., 152 inf. ff. 35 r–40 v. (pp. 46–53 edition of Magistretti, Milan, 1894)

p. 53. Post haec archiepiscopus vel presbyter dicit *Credo in unum,* et chorus dicit usque et *Homo factus est:* et statim magister scholarum incipit cum pueris suis, et dicit usque in finem, inclinatis semper subdiaconibus post altare, quousque flexus archiepiscopus vel presbyter oblationem suam per manus angeli committat. Tunc vero erigens se, et illo osculante altare, eriguntur. Diaconi vero tam diu inclinati stant, quam archiepiscopus; et cum eo erecti osculantur altare.

Missale Plenum. Twelfth century

Biblioteca Barberini, MS. XIII., 12

Rubric before *Supplices te:* Inclinet se retro altare et dicat iii: Deus omnipotens propitius esto mihi peccatori.

EBNER, p. 149.

Alcuin. 735–804 A.D.

Disputatio Puerorum. cap. x. De Missa

Quinta deinde ponitur inlatio in sanctificatione oblationis, a loco, ubi dicitur, *Per quem majestatem tuam laudent angeli,* usque ad eum locum, ubi *osanna in excelsis* canitur. In qua etiam ad laudem terrestrium creaturarum virtutumque coelestium universitas provocatur. Porro sexta hinc succedit: *Te igitur clementissime Pater,* quae est confirmatio sacramenti; ut oblatio sanctificata per Spiritum Sanctum in corpus et sanguinem conformetur. Septima vero oratio est, quam Dominus noster discipulis suis instituit orare dicens: *Pater noster, qui es in coelis.*

P. L. ci., 1135–1136.

Liber Sacramentorum. (Super oblata)

Memores sumus, aeterne Deus Pater omnipotens, gloriosissimae passionis filii tui, resurrectionis etiam, ascensionisque in caelum. Petimus ergo majestatem Deus, ut ascendant preces humilitatis nostrae in conspectum tuae clementiae et descendat super hunc panem, et super hunc calicem plenitudo tuae divinitatis. Descendat etiam Domine, illa Sancti Spiritus tui incomprehensibilis invisibilisque majestas, sicut quondam in patrum hostias descendebat. Per eumdem Dominum. P. L. ci., 449.

The Caroline Books. 794 A.D.

Bk. II., ch. xxvii

. . . Cum scilicet corporis et sanguinis Dominici sacramentum ad commemorationem suae passionis et nostrae salutis nobis concessum ab eodem mediatore Dei et hominum, per manum sacerdotis et invocationem divini nominis conficiatur. . . . Et nimirum ad horum consecrationem sacerdos infulatus, circumstantis populi deprecationes suis precibus miscens, cum interno rugitu memoriam faciat Dominicae passionis, et ab inferis resurrectionis, necnon et in coelos gloriosissimae ascensionis, et haec perferri per

manus angeli in sublime altare Dei et in conspectum majestatis deposcat. . . .

Ipse namque auctor humani generis, qui pro salute nostra carnem nostri causa non est dedignatus accipere, cum et Veteris Testamenti terminum et Novi, appropinquante suae sacratissimae passionis die, salutiferum constitueret initium, et in se lapide angulari duos ex adverso parietes connectens, et secundum Apostolum faciens utraque unum, accepto pane, benedicto ac fracto, hoc salutare discipulis dedit praeceptum: "Accipite," inquit, "et manducate, hoc est corpus meum:" similiter et calicem postquam coenavit accipiens, dedit discipulis suis dicens: "Accipite et bibite: hic est enim calix sanguis mei Novi et aeterni Testamenti qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Haec quotiescunque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis." . . .

Multum igitur, ut ultra quam mentis oculo perstringi queat, distat sacramentum Dominici corporis et sanguinis ab imaginibus pictorum arte depictis: cum videlicet illud efficiatur operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei, hae visibiliter manu artificis; illud consecretur a sacerdote divini nominis invocatione, hae pingantur a pictore humanae artis eruditione; illud angelicis manibus in sublime Dei deferatur altare, hae humanis manibus per artem structae ad mirantium intuitus ponantur in pariete.

P. L. xcviii., 1093, 1094, 1095.

Theodulph of Orleans. †821 A.D.

Liber de ordine Baptismi

Est enim sacrificium salutare, quod et in Veteri Testamento Melchisedech rex Salem in typo corporis et sanguinis Domini obtulit, et in Novo idem mediator Dei et hominum antequam traderetur adimplevit, cum accipiens panem et calicem, et benedicens eis, et tradens discipulis suis, haec in sui commemoratione fieri praecepit. Hoc ergo mysterium sacrificii, derelictis ac finitis veteribus hostiis,

Ecclesia celebrat, offerens panem propter panem vivum qui de coelo descendit, vinum pro eo qui dixit, *Ego sum vitis vera:* ut per visibilem sacerdotum oblationem, et invisibilem Sancti Spiritus consecrationem, panis et vinum in corporis et sanguinis Domini transeant dignitatem.

P. L. cv., 240.

Agobard of Lyons. † 840 A.D.

De Privilegio et Jure Sacerdotii

XV. Sacramenta etenim divina, baptisma scilicet, et confectio corporis ac sanguinis Domini, caeteraque in quibus salus et vita fidelium consistit, tam magna et sancta sunt, ut nec bonorum meritis meliorari, nec malorum perversitate possint deteriorari; cum ad invocationem summi Sacerdotis, non humana virtute, sed Sancti Spiritus perficiantur ineffabiliter majestate. P. L. civ., 142–143.

Liber contra libros quatuor Amalarii abbatis. § xiii.

Audiat etiam hoc Amalarius, quia sicut unum altare Ecclesiae, ita unus panis corporis Christi, et unus calix sanguinis ejus. Sic enim Apostolus accepit a Domino, et tradidit Ecclesiae: Quoniam Dominus noster Jesus Christus, in qua nocte tradebatur, accepit panem, et gratias agens, fregit, et dixit: Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem. Similiter et calicem, postquam coenavit, dicens: Hic calix novum testamentum est in meo sanguine. Hoc facite quotiescunque sumitis in meam commemorationem. Unde et Ecclesia ex traditione apostolorum his verbis consecrans mysterium sacri corporis et sanguinis Domini, designanter dicit Dominum dixisse apostolis: Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes. Hoc est enim corpus meum. Simili modo et posteaquam coenatum est, accipiens et hunc praeclarum calicem. Attendat fidelis quisque quid est quod dicit hunc. Videlicet quia calix quem sacerdos sacrificat, non est alius nisi ipse quem

Dominus apostolis tradidit. Sicut ergo de sanguine, sic quoque de corpore sentiendum est.

P. L. civ., 347.

Nicholas I. to Michael the Emperor. 860 A.D.

Quia vero [*sc.* altare] sacratum est Dei adjutorio, et benedictionem suscepit, unde et mensa sancta efficitur, panis iterum, qui super eum offertur, panis est quidem communis; sed quando ipse sacramento sacratus fuerit, corpus Christi in veritate fit, et dicitur. Sic et vinum modicum, aliquid digna existentia ante benedictionem, post sanctificationem Spiritus, sanguis Christi efficitur.

P. L. cxix., 778.

Rabanus Maurus. 776–856 A.D.

De Institutione Clericorum. Liber I., cap. xxxii. De officio missae

Hunc autem morem sacrificii primum Dominus noster Jesus Christus et magister instituit, quando commendavit Apostolis suis corpus et sanguinem suum, priusquam traderetur, sicut legitur in Evangelio: *Accepit*, inquit, *panem et benedicens fregit et dedit eis*, et ait, *Sumite, hoc est corpus meum, et accepto calice gratias agens dedit eis, et biberunt omnes ex illo, et reliqua.* Cum benedictione enim et gratiarum actione primum Dominus corporis et sanguinis sui sacramenta dedicavit, et apostolis tradidit, quod exinde apostoli imitati fecere et successores suos facere docuerunt, quod et nunc per totum orbem terrarum generaliter tota custodit Ecclesia. P. L. cvii., 322.

Liber de sacris ordinibus, sacramentis divinis et vestimentis sacerdotalibus ad Thiotmarum. Cap. xix. De ordine missae

Post hymnum angelicum quem concordi voce totus clerus simul cantat, sequitur oratio per quam sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini conficitur, quae sic inchoat. *Te igitur . . . sacrificia illibata. . . .* Sacrificia sunt quae etiam cum orationibus consecrantur.

P. L. cxii., 1182, 1183.

Ipseque voluit per nos panem et vinum offerri sibi et ab ipso divinitus consecrari, et fidelem populum credere verum esse mysterium quod ipse tradidit discipulis suis dicens: *Accipite et manducate ex eo omnes.* Similiter de calice dixit: *Accipite et bibite ex hoc omnes.* Et quando oculos ad coelum levavit et Patri gratias egit, nos in hoc docuit, quod nos Patrem semper supplicare debemus, ut ille tam magnum sacramentum per manus nostras perficere dignetur. Et cum diceret, *Haec quotiescumque feceretis, in mei memoriam facietis,* jussit nos illius passionis quam pro nobis sustinuit sedulo memores esse, et maxime eo tempore, quando hoc sacramentum celebramus, ejusque misericordiae atque bonitati nos commendamus. *Unde et . . . Dei nostri.* Hoc se sacerdos fecisse profitetur quod sibi a Domino imperatum est. Ideo enim ipsi sacerdotes Filii Dei Domini videlicet Jesu Christi fideliter memores esse debent, quia ipsi missam celebrant, et sacrificium offerunt Christi exemplo instructi; et scire debent quid celebrent, quia stulta postulatio est si postulat quis quod nescit. P. L. cxii., 1185–1186.

O Domine, omnium memores supradictorum bonitatum tuarum offerimus tuae majestati *hostiam puram* hoc est corde puro, quia purum est corpus tuum, quod de hoc pane fieri credimus. *Hostiam sanctam,* quia tu sanctificasti corpus tuum quando hominem in Deum assumpsisti, et nunc sanctifica hunc panem ut corpus tuum fiat. *Hostiam immaculatam,* quia tu sine macula peccati passus es pro nobis. *Panem sanctum vitae aeternae,* quia panis vivus es, qui de coelo descendisti, et corpus tuum in hoc pane a te sanctificato nos accipere voluisti, et per calicem passionis tuae nos sanguinem tuum sumere voluisti. Tu sanctifica hanc hostiam, ut nobis corpus tuum et sanguis tuus fiat. P. L. cxii., 1186.

Et in pane et vino passionis suae mysterium nos imitari voluit, quando discipulis suis dans panem ac calicem dixit,

Hoc est corpus meum; et *hic est calix sanguinis mei.* Et nos supplicare debemus ut sicut supradictorum patrum accepta Deo fuerunt munera, ita fiant et nostra. *Supplices te rogamus . . . majestatis tuae.* Humiliter ergo postulamus ut munera nostra super hoc altare quod videri potest oblata, Pater jubeat coelestis per manus sancti angeli sui perferri in illud altum altare quod est ante divinam majestatem suam, quod oculis nostris videre non possumus, quia corporale non est sed spiritale. Et sicut nos divinam majestatem Patris investigare non possumus, ita nec ea quae in conspectu ejus sunt debemus investigare, sed potius credere. *Ut quotquot . . . per Christum Dominum nostrum.* Orare quidem debemus Patrem coelestem, ut omnes qui ex ipsius altaris participatione supra quod nos offerimus Deo Patri in commemoratione Filii sui Domini Dei nostri Jesu Christi, corpus et sanguinem praedicti Filii Dei sumpserimus, omnem benedictionem coelestem accipere mereamur per ipsum Christum Dominum nostrum. P. L. cxii., 1187.

Per Christum . . . praestas nobis. Hoc precamur ut per ipsum Christum Filium tuum unigenitum, per quem omnia bona creata sunt sanctificata et vivificata, haec sacramenta benedicas, et nobis ad remedium sempiternum accipiendum praebeas.

P. L. cxii., 1188.

Amalarius. †c. 850 A.D.

De Ecclesiasticis Officiis, Liber III., cap. xxiv.

Quo ordine id perficiendum sit, ex Domini institutione addiscitur: accipit sacerdos panem manibus suis exemplo Christi; de quo dictum est: *Accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus,* et reliqua; similiter et calicem.

P. L. cv., 1140.

At si figi necesse est in loco ubi dicitur: *Accipiens panem,* seorsum necesse est [ut] figuretur super panem, et seorsum

super vinum, secundum modo quo Christus usus, in acceptione panis et calicis. P. L. cv., 1141.

In eo pane commendavit Christus corpus suum, et in calice sanguinem suum, atque subjunxit: Haec quotiescunque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis. Hic concrepant verba Dominicae mensae cum toto officio missae. Canitur hic, Accipiens panem, et reliqua quod actitatur a sacerdote, quando suscipit oblatam in secreta missae aut quando hic eam elevat. Gratias egit in Hymno. Vere dignum et justum est: benedicit in praesenti loco, frangit circa communionem. Hic credimus naturam simplicem panis et vini mixti verti in naturam rationabilem, scilicet corporis et sanguinis Christi. P. L. cv., 1141.

Precatur sacerdos ut praesens oblatio ita sit accepta in conspectu divinae majestatis, quatenus sumpturi eam, simul fiant coelestes et gratia Dei repleti. Mira et magna fides sanctae Ecclesiae, quae suis oculis videt quod mortalibus deest: videt quid credere debeat, quamvis nondum videat quod in specie est. Credit sacrificium praesens per angelorum manus deferri ante conspectum Domini, et sentit mandendum esse ab humano ore. Credit namque corpus et sanguinem Domini esse, ac hoc morsu coelesti benedictione impleri animas sumentium. P. L. cv., 1142.

Eclogae de Officio Missae

Qualiter quaedam orationes et cruces in *Te igitur* agendae sunt.

Rubrics:

Before A 21: Hic signat oblationem et calicem tribus vicibus, non tamen sub una cruce, sed separatim singulis singulas faciens cruces.

Before B 6: Hic nomina vivorum memorentur, si volueris, sed non Dominica die, nisi caeteris diebus.

Before C 62: Si fuerit natale sanctorum, hic dicat: *Sed et diem natalitii beati illius vel beatorum illorum celebrantes.*

Before D 1: Hic inclinat se usque ad altare, dicens.

Before E 1: Hic erigit se sursum, solam oblatam hic benedicit.

Before E 15: Hic ambos signat, id est, oblationem et calicem.

Before G 43: Hic quatuor vicibus solam oblationem signat, et in quinta vice super calicem solum crucem faciens.

Before I 1: Hic inclinat se iterum juxta altare, dicens.

Before I 6: Hic orat apud se quod voluerit. Deinde dicit.

Before I 22: Hic se erigit, haec verba dicens.

Before J 1: Hic orationes duae dicuntur, una super dypticos, altera post lectionem nominum. Et hoc quotidianis vel in agendis tantummodo diebus.

Before J 18: Et recitantur. Deinde postquam recitata fuerint, dicit.

Before L 1: Hic archdiaconus erigens se venit, et involvens calicem mappula, levat illum contra domnum papam.

Before L 9: Hic ambos signat, id est, oblationem et calicem, tribus vicibus, singulis singulas faciens cruces.

Before L 15: Hic levat domnus papa oblationes duas usque ad oram calicis; et tangens eum de oblationibus, tenente illum archdiacono.

Before L 36: Tunc dicit in altum.

After L 40: Tunc reponit oblationes in altare.

Council of Quierci. 858 A.D.

Epistola Episcoporum ad Ludovicum, Regem Germaniae

Cap. XV. Et nos Episcopi, Domino consecrati, non sumus hujusmodi homines ut sicut homines seculares in vassalatico debeamus nos cuilibet commendare, sed ad defensionem et ad adjutorium gubernationis in ecclesiastico regimine nos Ecclesiasque nostras committere, aut jurationis sacramentum, quod nos evangelica et apostolica atque canonica auctoritas vetat, debeamus quoquo modo facere. Manus enim chrismate sacro peruncta, quae de pane et vino aqua mixto per orationem et crucis signum conficit corporis et Christi sanguinis sacramentum, abominable est, quicquid ante ordinationem fecerit, ut post ordinationem episcopatus seculare tangat ullo modo sacramentum.

Mansi, XVIII B, 119.

"Micrologus." Eleventh century

De Ecclesiasticis Observationibus

Cap. X. Cooperitur quoque calix non tam causa mysterii quam cautelae, usque dum finito Canone dictur: *Oremus, Praeceptis salutaribus moniti.* Discooperitur tamen, dum legitur, ubi dicitur: *Accipiens et hunc praeclarum calicem.* Et ibi: *Per ipsum, et cum ipso,* et hoc fortasse ideo quia cautius levatur sine operimento quam coopertus.

P. L. cli., 983–984.

Cap. XV., De acceptione oblationis in manus

Deinde panis in manus accipitur, et antequam reponatur in altare, benedicitur. Item et calix elevatus ante depositionem benedicitur. Nam et ipse Dominus in Evangelio utrumque legitur benedixisse antequam dimitteret e manibus. Accepta enim in manibus benedixit, postea discipulis dedit (Matth. XXVI). P. L. cli., 987.

Cap. XXIII., Brevis descriptio celebrandae missae

N.B. This includes the Canon in which the following rubrical directions are found.

Before A 1: Canon juxta Romanam auctoritatem est iste.
Before A 21: Hic signat sacerdos oblationem et calicem tribus vicibus, sub una cruce.
Before B 6: Hic nomina vivorum memorentur, si volueris, sed non Dominica.
Before D 1: Hic inclinatur usque ad altare dicens.
Before E 1: Erectus autem cum tribus crucibus benedicit.
Before E 15: Hic separatim signat oblatam et calicem.
Before G 43: Hic tres cruces super utrumque simul facit, et quartam super oblationem, et quintam super calicem.
Before I 1: Hic inclinat se juxta altare dicens.
Before I 22: Hic erigit se dicens.
Before J 1: Hic duae orationes dicuntur.
Before J 18: Et recitantur nomina.
Before L 9: Hic tres cruces super utrumque simul facit.
Before L 15: Hic cum oblata quatuor cruces facit super calicem, et quintam in latere ipsius.
Before L 36: Hic elevat oblatam cum calice dicens.
After L 40: Et deponit oblatam dicens.

P. L. cli., 993–994.

Ratramn of Corbey. fl. c. 868 A.D.

Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini

IX. Panis qui per sacerdotis ministerium Christi corpus conficitur.

X. Vinum quoque, quod sacerdotali consecratione Christi sanguinis efficitur sacramentum. . . . Post mysticam consecrationem. P. L. cxxi., 131.

XVII. Accessit sancti Spiritus per sacerdotis consecrationem virtus, et efficax facta est non solum corpora, verum etiam animas diluere, et spirituales sordes spirituali potentia dimovere. P. L. cxxi., 135.

XL. Nec tamen falso dicitur quod in mysteriis illis Dominus vel immoletur, vel patiatur quoniam illius mortis atque passionis habens similitudinem quarum existunt repraesentationes. Unde Dominicum corpus et sanguis Dominicus appellantur, quoniam ejus sumunt appellationem, cujus existunt sacramentum. Hinc beatus Isidorus in libris Etymologiarum (*lib.* vi., *cap.* 19), sic ait: "Sacrificium dictum, quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicae passionis. Unde hoc, eo jubente, corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus, quod dum fit ex fructibus terrae, sanctificatur et fit sacramentum, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei," etc.

P. L. cxxi., 144–145.

XLI. Et iste doctor catholicus sacrum illud Dominicae passionis mysterium in memoriam pro nobis Dominicae passionis docet agendum. Hoc dicens ostendit Dominicam passionem semel esse factam, ejus vero memoriam in sacris solemnibus repraesentari.

P. L. cxxi., 145.

XLII. Unde et panis qui offertur, ex fructibus terrae cum sit assumptus, in Christi corpus dum sanctificatur, transponitur: sicut et vinum, cum ex vite defluxerit, divini tamen sanctificatione mysterii efficitur sanguis Christi; non quidem visibiliter, sed, sicut ait praesens doctor, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.

P. L. cxxi., 145.

Paschasius Radbertus. † 865 A.D.

De Corpore et Sanguine Domini

IV. 3. Vera utique Christi caro, quae crucifixa est et sepulta, vere illius carnis sacramentum, quod per sacerdotem super altare in verbo Christi per Spiritum Sanctum divinitus consecratur; unde ipse Dominus clamat: *Hoc est corpus meum.*

P. L. cxx., 1279.

VIII. 1. Nec praesentiam divinae majestatis veritus, dum cogitat nihil amplius, quam quae videntur, nec intelligit miser, quod numquam caro Christi, nisi de manu ejus et sublimi ara ubi Christus pontifex futurorum bonorum pro omnibus assistit, jure accipitur. Unde sacerdos cum haec incipit immolare inter caetera: *Jube*, inquit, *haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinae majestatis tuae.* Et cogitas, o homo, aliunde illud accipere quam de altari, ubi sublimius transpositum consecratur?

2. Sed fortassis ad haec "caeca cogitatio" dicit: Et quomodo in coelum ante conspectum divinae majestatis tam subito offertur cum hic aut panis aut caro licet dicatur in manu sacerdotis [et] visibiliter semper [*v. l.* super altare] teneatur . . .? Disce quia Deus Spiritus illocaliter ubique est. Intellige quia spiritalia haec sicut nec localiter, sic utique nec carnaliter ante conspectum divinae majestatis in sublime feruntur. Cogita igitur si quippiam corporeum potest esse sublimius, cum substantia panis et vini in Christi carnem et sanguinem efficaciter interius commutatur; ita ut deinceps post consecrationem jam vera Christi caro et sanguis veraciter credatur, et non aliud quam Christus panis de coelo a credentibus aestimetur. Putasne aliud esse altare ubi Christus pontifex assistit quam corpus suum, per quod et in quo Deo Patri vota fidelium et fidem credentium offert; quod si veraciter corpus Christi altare illud coeleste creditur, jam non aliunde carnem et sanguinem quam de ipso Christi corpore sumere te putabis? P. L. cxx., 1286, 1287, 1288.

XII. 1. Vere credere et indubitanter scire debemus infra catholicam Ecclesiam, ubi catholica fide hoc mysterium celebratur, nihil a bono majus, nihilque a malo [minus] percipi sacerdote, nihilque aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis, dum catholice consecratur, quia non in merito consecrantis, sed in verbo efficitur Creatoris et virtute

Spiritus sancti, ut caro Christi et sanguis, non alia quam quae de Spiritu Sancto creata est, vere fide credatur, et spiritali intelligentia degustetur. Si enim in merito esset sacerdotis, non ad Christum pertineret; nunc autem sicut ipse est qui baptizat, ita ipse est qui per Spiritum Sanctum, hanc suam efficit carnem, et transfundit vinum in sanguinem. Quis enim alius in utero creare potuerit, ut Verbum caro fieret? Sic itaque in hoc mysterio credendum est, quod eadem virtute Spiritus Sancti per verbum Christi caro ipsius et sanguis efficiatur invisibili operatione. Unde et sacerdos: *Jube haec perferri per manus angeli tui in sublime altare tuum in conspectu divinae majestatis tuae;* ut quid perferri illuc ea deposcit, nisi ut intelligatur quod in ejus sacerdotio ista fiant. Ipse enim factus est pontifex in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech, teste apostolo, ad interpellandum pro nobis, offerens semetipsum Deo Patri. . . . Prius autem quam corpus consecratione fiat, oblatio sacerdotis est, sicut ipse confitetur, vel cunctae familiae offerentis eam: sed in verbo et virtute Spiritus Sancti nova fit creatura in corpore Creatoris ad nostrae reparationis salutem. Unde juxta sublimis aram altaris semper adsistere scriptura teste probatur, ut ex ejus immolatione corpus et sanguinem percipiamus. P. L. cxx., 1311, 1312.

XV. Quibus verbis hoc mysterium conficitur

Nulli dubium quod sicut quando in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti tertio mergimur in fonte, tunc utique baptizamur, non in virtute illius et potestate qui haec dicit, sed in virtute Christi, qui hoc praecepit, dicens: Ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti. Sic utique et hoc sacramentum non meritis, non verbis humanis, sed procul dubio divinis efficitur et consecratur mandatis. Creatur enim ibidem ex aliquo, non qualiscunque, sed nova salutis creatura, caro et sanguis Christi, veluti in baptismo

homines nova efficiuntur creatura, et corpus Christi. (*Ambr.*) Idcirco non aestimandum est quod alterius verbis, quod ullius alterius meritis quod potestate alicujus ita fiant, sed verbo Creatoris quo cuncta creata sunt visibilia et invisibilia: cujus ergo potentia creata sunt prius, ejus utique verbo ad melius recreantur, quia nemo creator alicujus rei, aut recreator, nisi unus Deus catholice praedicatur. Propterea veniendum est ad verba Christi, et credendum quod in ejusdem verbis ista conficiuntur. Reliqua vero omnia quae sacerdos dicit, aut clerus canit, nihil aliud quam laudes, et gratiarum actiones sunt, aut certe obsecrationes fidelium, postulationes, petitiones. Verba autem Christi sicut divina sunt, ita efficacia, ut nihil aliud proveniat quam quod jubent, quia aeterna sunt. *Coelum*, inquit, *et terra transient, verba autem mea non transibunt* (Matth. xxiv. 35), sed facient omnia ad quae praemissa sunt, quia Patris nonnisi unum et substantivum et consubstantiale ac sempiternum est Verbum. Unde sacerdos prius inter caetera etiam verba evangelistarum assumens, ait: *Qui pridie quam pateretur accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, elevatis oculis in coelum ad te Patrem suum omnipotentem, gratias tibi agens benedixit, fregit et dedit discipulis suis.* Ecce usque ad istud locum verba sunt evangelistarum; porro deinceps verba sunt Dei, potestate et omni efficentia plena: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes, Hoc est enim corpus meum.* Sed ne forte putares quod de illo uno tantum pane et in illa una hora hoc eum esse jusserit secutus adjungens ait; *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* (Luc. xxii. 20 *et seqq.*). Unde fatendum, quod quidquid tunc illud fuit quod Apostoli ab eo perceperunt, hoc totum est, quia id ipsum est: et si velis audire quid est, *Hoc est*, inquit, *corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur.* Crede, o fili, quia ita est, quoniam ipse dixit, et factum dubitare non potes; *Ipse mandavit* et *creatum est.* Praeceptum ergo posuit, *In meam commemorationem hoc facite:* et

ideo quotiescunque fit catholice, vere hoc fit quod dictum est: *Hoc est corpus meum.*

2. *Simili modo posteaquam coenatum est:* refert sacerdos verba evangelistae: *Accipiens hunc praeclarum calicem.* Et notandum quod hunc quem offerimus, et non alium, in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, [ab eo quod continet id quod continetur ostendens, dicit eum accepisse,] *item tibi gratias agens benedixit, et dedit discipulis suis, dicens.* Audisne utique, quod ipse gratias egerit, quod benedixerit? et ideo licet nos gratias agamus Deo, ille est qui pro nobis gratias agit per se, et nos tamen per illum; et quia per illum, ejus gratiarum actio jure dicitur. Sic itaque, licet sacerdos benedicat, ipse est qui benedicit et frangit; alioquin nisi ejus esset benedictio, nulla sanctitas in eo esset: unde in Levitico ad Aaron et ad filios ejus: *Invocabitis ergo nomen meum super filios Israel, et ego benedicam eos* (Num. iv. 27). Sacerdos ergo invocat, sed ipse benedicit et frangit [*v. l.* Quod sacerdos in consecratione quorumlibet invocat, sed Christus benedicit, frangit et tribuit]; quia nisi ille frangeret hunc panem, parvuli omnes jejuni remanerent. Hinc quoque propheta suspirans, quia necdum Christus venerat, aiebat in Lamentationibus suis: *Parvuli petierunt panem, nec erat qui frangeret eis* (Thren. iv. 4). Et ideo hic solus est qui frangit hunc panem, et per manus ministrorum distribuit etiam calicem credentibus, dicens: *Accipite et bibite ex hoc omnes,* tam ministri quam et reliqui credentes: *Hic est calix sanguinis mei novi et aeterni testamenti.* In hoc quippe verbo sanguis efficitur, quod ante vinum et aqua fuerat. Efficitur ergo sanguis, sed ille utique quem discipulis tradidit; sanguis plane Novi et aeterni Testamenti, quod testamentum nunquam immutabitur, quia aeternum est; nunquam veterascet, nunquam irritum erit; et hoc est testamentum haereditatis nostrae, per quod nobis divina et coelestia traduntur.

3. Hoc igitur est mysterium fidei. De hujus namque

sanguinis figura populus sanctificatus est Veteris Testamenti. Sed in illo sanguine umbra erat, hic autem veritas: *qui pro vobis*, inquit, *effundetur et pro multis in remissionem peccatorum.* Nam ubi Lucas dixit, *pro vobis*, ibi Matthaeus *pro multis* posuit. (Matth. xxvi. 28); unde credendum quod Christus utrumque dixerit, quia hic sanguis et pro apostolis et pro multis qui crediturі erant per verbum eorum effusus est. Hic utique et non alius, neque alicujus alterius, sed sanguis Jesu Christi in hoc verbo efficitur. Viget autem hoc verbum et manet, *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, qui pro vobis fundetur et pro multis.* Quapropter, o homo, quotiescunque bibis hunc calicem, aut manducas hunc panem, non alium sanguinem te putes bibere, quam eum qui pro te et pro omnibus effusus est in remissionem peccatorum; neque aliam carnem, quam quae pro te et pro omnibus tradita est et pependit in cruce, quia sic Veritas testatur: *Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur.* Et de calice: *Hic enim sanguis meus est, qui pro vobis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.* Unde sicut tunc in remissionem peccatorum et traditus, ita adhuc hodie in remissionem comeditur et potatur delictorum: ut quia in terris sine quotidianis levibusque delictis vivere non possumus, ut praemisi, tali esca et potu refecti, sine macula et ruga inveniamur, et non solum hoc, sed etiam omni benedictione coelesti, quae in illis est, repleamur, ac per hoc unum corpus cum illo et in illo maneamus, uti Christus caput et nos omnes membra censeamur.

P. L. cxx., 1321–1324.

Florus Magister. † 859 A.D.

De Expositione Missae

42. Post has laudes et gratiarum actiones pro tanta gratia redemptionis nostrae, quae in illo divino mysterio agitur et commendatur, facto totius Ecclesiae silentio, in quo cessante omni strepitu verborum, sola ad Deum

dirigatur intentio, et devotio cordium, sociatis sibi omnium votis et desideriis, incipit sacerdos orationem fundere, qua ipsum mysterium Dominici corporis et sanguinis consecratur. P. L. cxix., 43.

43. Pro qua autem re dicit sacerdos ad Deum Patrem *rogamus et petimus*, nisi pro eo quod sequitur, videlicet ut ea quae ipsi offeruntur dona, munera sancta, sacrificia accepta, id est beneplacita habeat et benedicat? Sacerdotum est enim offere et majestatem Dei invocare; Dei est autem dignanter suscipere, et ea quae offeruntur benedicere, sicut in lege praecepit sacerdotibus dicens: *Sic benedicetis filiis Israel, et dicetis eis*, et post verba benedictionis subjungit: *Invocabunt nomen meum super filios Israel et ego benedicam eis.* Quid apertius? Illi invocabunt et ego benedicam, et tamen supra eis dixerat, *Sic benedicetis*, sed illi exorando, ille largiendo. Ita ergo et in oblatione divini sacrificii sacerdotes exhibent offerendi et supplicandi ministerium; sed Deus largiter benedictionis donum per unum et verum Sacerdotem, per quem et oblata sanctificat, et sanctificata acceptat, dicunt itaque.

44. *Uti accepta habeas et benedicas*, ac si suppliciter dicant: Petimus ut haec Spiritu tuo sanctifices atque ore tuo benedicas, ut quod nostrae humilitatis geritur ministerio, tuae virtutis impleatur effectu. P. L. cxix., 43-44.

59. *Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus*, etc. Oratur omnipotens, ut oblationem suis sacris altaribus impositam et tantis precibus commendatam, ipse per virtutem descendentis [Spiritus] ita legitimam et perfectam Eucharistiam efficiat, ut in omnibus sit ascripta. . . . Sit quoque ejusdem Spiritus Sancti operante virtute, rationabilis et per haec omnia singulariter Deo grata et acceptabilis, ut quamvis de simplicibus terrae frugibus sumpta,

divinae benedictionis ineffabili potentia efficiatur corpus et sanguis unigeniti Filii Dei, sicut ipse testatur: *Caro mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus. . . .*

60. *Qui pridie quam pateretur accepit panem,* etc., usque ad *haec quotienscumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis. . . .* In his verbis, sine quibus nulla lingua nulla regio, nulla civitas, id est nulla pars Ecclesiae catholicae conficire potest, id est consecrare sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini, ipse Dominus tradidit apostolis, unde universalis Ecclesia jugem memoriam sui Redemptoris celebret, et apostoli generaliter omni Ecclesiae. Christi ergo virtute et verbis semper consecratur et consecrabitur. Illius sermo est qui coelestia sacramenta sanctificat. Ille in suis sacerdotibus quotidie loquitur. Illi funguntur officio, ille majestate divinae potestatis operatur. Ipse enim ille verus Melchisedech, qui haec sancta sacrificia, quae tunc in mysterio praefiguravit, per oblationem sui corporis suique sanguinis adimplevit. Ipse ex Spiritus paracliti virtute et coelesti benedictione sanctum corpus et sanguinem suum esse perficit. . . . Unde et Ecclesia ex traditione his verbis consecrans mysterium sacri corporis et sanguinis Domini. designanter dicit Dominum dixisse apostolis: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes; hoc est enim corpus meum. Simili modo postquam coenatum est, accipiens et hunc calicem praeclarum.* Attendat fidelis, quisque, quid est quod dicat *hunc,* videlicet, quod calix, quem sacerdos catholicus sacrificat, non est alius, nisi ipse quem Dominus apostolis tradidit.

66. *Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus,* etc. Haec verba mysterii tam profunda, tam mira et stupenda quis comprehendere sufficiat? Quis inde digne aliquid loquatur? Magis veneranda sunt et pavenda quam discutienda. Beatus tamen Gregorius, idoneus tanti mysterii interpres, in quodam loco aliquid de iis tanquam de re ineffabili pene ineffabiliter loquitur. Quis enim fidelium,

inquit, habere dubium possit, in ipsa immolationis hora, ad sacerdotis vocem coelos aperiri, in illo Jesu Christi mysterio angelorum choros adesse, summis ima sociari, terram coelestibus jungi, unum quid ex visibilibus atque invisibilibus fieri? . . . Fit ergo et in ista oratione et oblatione sacra consecrationis aliquid incomprehensibile et ineffabile, et multo his omnibus mirabilius, ut per angelica ministeria et supplicationes tanquam de sublimi altari divinae majestatis conspectibus offerantur in illa immolationis hora, cum astantibus sibi ministris coelestibus Christus, ut proposita consecret, adesse credendus est.

P. L. cxix., 51, 52, 53, 58, 60.

72. . . . Et statim conclusio totius consecrationis sequitur dicendo:

73. *Per quem omnia semper bona creas*, etc. Per ipsum enim omnipotens Deus haec bona omnia quae sacris altaribus consecrantur, non solum in exordio mundi creavit, condendo quod non erat. . . . Per ipsum enim, ut dictum est, Deus Pater haec omnia bona semper creat, et creata ac suis conspectibus oblata sanctificat, ut quae erant simplex creatura, fiant sacramenta. . . . Hoc ergo ad tanti mysterii consecrationem, sicut in omni legitima oratione respondent fideles, et respondendo subscribunt.

P. L. cxix., 64, 65.

Opuscula adversus Amalarium. I. 9

Prorsus panis ille sacrosanctae oblationis corpus est Christi, non materie vel specie visibili, sed virtute et potentia spirituali. Neque enim in agro nobis corpus Christi gignitur, aut in vinea sanguis ejus exoritur, vel torculari exprimitur. Simplex e frugibus panis conficitur, simplex a botris vinum liquatur, accedit ad haec offerentis Ecclesiae fides, accedit mysticae precis consecratio, accedit divinae virtutis infusio, sicque, mire, et ineffabili modo, quod est naturaliter ex germine terreno panis et vinum,

efficitur spiritualiter corpus Christi, id est vitae et salutis nostrae mysterium, in quo aliud oculis corporis, aliud fidei videmus obtentu; nec id tantum quod ore percipimus, sed quod mente credimus, libamus. P. L. cxix., 77.

Pseudo-Alcuin. Tenth or eleventh century

De Divinis Officiis. Cap. xl.

Missa autem dicitur, quasi transmissa, vel quasi transmissio, eo quod populus fidelis de suis meritis non praesumens, preces et oblationes, quas Deo omnipotenti offerre desiderat, per ministerium et orationem sacerdotis ad Deum transmittat. P. L. ci., 1246.

Hucusque praefatio et exhortatio, huic obsecratio sequitur.

Post has laudes . . . incipit sacerdos orationem fundere qua ipsum mysterium Dominici corporis et sanguinis consecratur.

Sacerdotum enim est offere et majestatem Dei invocare.

Uti accepta habeas et benedicas, ac si suppliciter dicat: Petimus, ut haec Spiritu tuo sanctifices, atque ore benedicas, ut quod nostrae humilitatis geritur ministerio, tuae virtutis impleatur effectu. P. L. ci., 1256, 1257.

Hucusque obsecratio: huic sequitur consecratio ita incipiens: *Quam oblationem,* etc. Oratur Deus, ut oblationem suis altaribus impositam, et tantis precibus commendatam, ipse per virtutem Spiritus Sancti ita perfectam Eucharistiam accipiat . . . ut quamvis de simplicibus terrae frugibus sumpta, benedictionis potentia efficiatur corpus et sanguis Filii Dei. P. L. ci., 1260.

Christi ergo virtute et verbis iste panis et calix ab initio consecratus est, et semper consecratur, et consecrabitur. Ipse enim loquens per sacerdotes sua verba,

coelesti benedictione sanctum corpus et sanguinem suum perficit. P. L. ci., 1260.

Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus, jube haec perferri, et reliqua. Haec verba tam profunda quis comprehendere sufficiat? Quis inde digne aliqua loquatur? Magis veneranda sunt, quam discutienda. Beatus tamen Gregorius idoneus tanti sacramenti interpres, quodam loco de eis tanquam de re ineffabili pene ineffabiliter loquens: Quis, inquit, fidelium habere dubium possit, in ipsa immolationis hora ad sacerdotis vocem coelos aperiri, in illo Jesu Christi mysterio angelorum choros adesse, summis ima sociari, terrena coelestibus jungi, unum quiddam ex visibilibus atque invisibilibus fieri? Idem quoque alibi: Uno, inquit, eodem tempore ac momento, et in excelsis rapitur per ministerium angelorum consociandum corpori Christi, et ante oculos sacerdotis in altari videtur. . . . Fit ergo in ista oblatione aliquid ineffabile, ut per angelica ministeria, tanquam de sublime altari, divinae majestati offeratur, cum astantibus ministris coelestibus Christus, ut oblata consecret, adesse credendus est. P. L. ci., 1262–1263.

Confessio Fidei. IV., ii.

Christi enim virtute et verbis panis ille et calix ab initio consecratus est. Christi virtute et verbis consecratus semper et consecrabitur. Ipse in suis sacerdotibus quotidie loquitur. Illius sermo est, qui coelestia sacramenta sanctificat. Sacerdotes funguntur officio, sed Christus majestate divinae potestatis operatur. Ipse est enim ille verus Melchisedech, qui sancta sacrificia, quae ille in mysterio tunc praefiguravit, per oblationem sui corporis suique sanguinis adimplet, et semper ab ipso initio, quo instituit adimplevit. Ipse ea Spiritus paracleti virtute, et coelesti benedictione sanctum corpus et sanguinem suum esse perfecit. P. L. ci., 1087.

Acta Synodi Atrebatensis. 1025 A.D.

II. De Corpore et Sanguine Domini

Quod quidem sacrificium de pane, et vino cum aqua misto, ineffabili sanctificatione, cruce et verbis illius in altari consecratur, dumque passionis et resurrectionis ejus, atque in coelum ascensionis ibidem salutifera memoria agitur, verum ac proprium corpus ipsius Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et sanguis verus ac proprius efficitur, quamvis alius esse videatur. P. L. cxlii., 1278.

Council at Rome. 1079 A.D.

Maxima siquidem pars panem et vinum per sacrae orationis verba et sacerdotis consecrationem, Spiritu Sancto invisibiliter operante, converti substantialiter in corpus Dominicum de Virgine natum, quod et in cruce pependit, et in sanguinem qui de ejus latere militis effusus est lancea, asserebat, atque auctoritatibus orthodoxorum sanctorum Patrum, tam Graecorum quam Latinorum, modis omnibus defendebat.

Berengar's Oath

Ego Berengarius corde credo, et ore confiteor, panem et vinum quae ponuntur in altari per mysterium sacrae orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram et propriam ac vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Jesu Christi. P. L. cxlviii., 809, 811.

Berengar of Tours. † 1088 A.D.

De Sacra Coena

In sequentibus: *Offerimus majestati tuae de tuis donis ac datis*, quod necessario intelligitur de multitudine creaturae tuae vel de creatura panis et vini, *panem sanctum*, quod necessario intelligis panem, qui propria locutione dicitur panis. Hic enim sanctificari potest ad sacerdotum praeces, quod minime potuit panis tropicus, qui de coelo descendit, qui ipsos potius sanctificat sacerdotes.

Edition of A. F. and F. Th. Vischer, Berlin, 1834, pp. 279–280.

Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers. † 1088 A.D.

Epistola ad Berengarium Magistrum

Dominus Jesus *pridie quam . . . facietis.* Hujus verbi, per quod omnia facta sunt, virtute et effectu panem post consecrantis in haec verba sacerdotis sacrationem, verum corpus Christi, et vinum eodem modo verum sanguinem esse credimus et confitemur.

P. L. cxlvii., 1203.

Durandus of Troarn. † 1088 A.D.

Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Christi

In qua sententia illud diligenter et praecipue perpendum proponimus quod ex terrae fructibus accipi ac prece mystica corpus Christi ac sanguinem consecrari dicitur per quamdam manum divinam, a forma visibili invisibiliter operante Spiritu Sancto, hoc tam magnum fiat sacramentum ad invisibilem speciem indubitanter perduci pronuntiatur, revera enim ex visibilibus et terrenis substantiis, id est pane et vino aqua misto, incomprehensibili Sancti Spiritus opificio, verbis quoque mysticis sanctum Domini corpus ac verus sanguis efficitur, mutata non specie, sed natura. P. L. cxlix., 1379–1380.

Hoc facite. Quid est, hoc facite? Id est hoc corpus, hunc sanguinem meis verbis, mea invocatione conficite.

P. L. cxlix., 1381.

Guitmund of Aversa. † 1089 A.D.

De Corpore et Sanguine Domini

Quidem negare nequeunt substantiam corporis Christi cibo inesse Dominico, panem tamen et vinum per verba Salvatoris in carnem ejus et sanguinem verti nequaquam credentes. P. L. cxlix., 1480–1481.

Odo of Cambray. † 1113 A.D.

Expositio in Canonem Missae

Tolle verba Christi, non fiunt sacramenta Christi. Vis fieri Christi corpus et Sanguinem, appone Christi sermonem.

Facit sermo Veritatis quod dicit: *quia ipse dixit et facta sunt, ipse mandavit et creata sunt.* Sine dubio fit in creatura quod Christi sermo dicit de creatura. Etenim omnipotens sermo tuus, o Genitor. Fit ergo sermone Christi corpus et sanguis Christi. P. L. clx., 1063.

Bruno of Segni. † 1123 A.D.

Commentaria in Matthaeum. P. IV., Cap. xxvi., § 104

Ecce sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech panem et vinum virtute ineffabili in sui corporis et sanguinis substantiam convertit. P. L. clxv., 290.

Dixit enim tunc per se: dicit et modo per suos ministros. *Hoc est corpus meum:* et tanta est ejus verbi virtus et efficacia, ut statim fiat quod dicitur. Similiter autem, dum dicit: *Hic est sanguis meus*, mox in ejus sanguinem vinum convertitur. P. L. clxv., 291.

Sententiarum. Lib. IV., Cap. ix.

Ipse enim dixit, et facta sunt, ipse mandavit, et creata sunt. (Ps. xxxii. 9.) Sic igitur, et modo cum dixisset: *Hoc est corpus meum;* et *hic est sanguis meus;* tanta fuit potentia in verbo ejus, ut illico et panis mutaretur in carnem, et vinum mutaretur in sanguinem. P. L. clxv., 1005.

Sed quare nos in istis laboramus? Ipsius verba nobis sufficiant. Ipse enim dixit. *Hoc est corpus meum;* postea dicit: *Hic est sanguis meus.* . . . Si Christo non credimus, cui credimus? Ubi tanta autoritas est, ibi argumenta necessaria non sunt. P. L. clxv., 1007.

Honorius of Autun. † 1120 A.D.

Gemma Animae. Lib. I., cap. 52. De tertio ordine

In tertio ordine panem in manum suscipimus, et benedicimus, et tempus gratiae innotescimus, quo Simeon Christum jam natum panem vivum in manus accepit, et gaudens benedixit. Deinde calicem levamus, et bene-

dicimus, et tempus coenae exprimimus, quo Christus panem et calicem manibus elevavit et benedixit, et inde corpus et sanguinem apostolis tradidit. Unde adhuc cum verba Domini in ordine recitantur, panis et vinum in corpus et sanguinem Domini commutantur. P. L. clxxii., 559–560.

Hildebert of Tours. † 1133 A.D.

De Mysterio Missae

Quaesumus ut placatus.
Hoc sane totum verbis confertur in illis,
Quae subdit sacrifex, non sua, sed Domini.
Quippe recensurus, quae protulit ille, vel egit,
Cum coenans idem, coena beata fit.
Qui pridie quam pateretur, accipit panem.
Panis in hoc verbo, sed adhuc communis, ab ara
Sumitur, et sumptum tollit utraque manu.
Presbyter hinc idem, cum pervenit ad *benedixit,*
Imprimit elato mystica signa crucis.
Nec prius in mensam demittit, quam tua, Christi,
Verba repraesentans explicit ista super.
Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes.
Hinc levat et calicem, signatque, nec ante reponit
Quam super Auctoris verba retractet ita:
Accipite et bibite ex eo omnes, usque *in remissionem peccatorum.*
Si qua fides patribus, quos vita beata perennat
Esca fit haec animae, quae modo carnis erat.
His verbis utrumque novas acquirere vires
Majoresque suis scripta probata docent.
Sub cruce, sub verbo natura novatur, et aram,
Panis honorificat carne, cruore cruore calix.
Presbyter idcirco, cum verba venitur ad illa,
In quibus altari gratia tanta datur,
Tollit utrumque, notans, quod sit communibus escis
Altior, et quiddam majus utrumque gerat.

P. L. clxxi., 1186–1187.

Stephen of Autun. †1139 A.D.

Tractatus de Sacramento Altaris

Quod sacerdos orat oblationem panis et vini fieri corpus Domini et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, primo factum est coenantibus discipulis, in his verbis a Christo prolatis: *Hoc est corpus meum. Hic est calix sanguinis mei novi et aeterni testamenti.* Sed priusquam sacerdos haec verba proferat, quod sequitur, praecedentibus continuat dicens: *Qui pridie quam pateretur accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas: et elevatis oculis in coelum, ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem, tibi gratias agens,* etc. Dum haec verba profert, sumit panem de altari, et elevatum facto signaculo crucis benedicit, et postea praetaxatis verbis Domini et repraesentatis, super corporale deponit. Deinde calicem tollit, et signans repraesentat verba Domini, dicens: *Benedixit, dedit discipulis suis dicens: Accipite et bibite ex hoc omnes. Hic est calix sanguinis mei,* etc. O insigne miraculum! O mirabile et divinissimum sacramentum! Quae mens non expaveat? Quis intellectus non deficiat? Omnis sensus hebescit, omnis ratio evanescit; prorsus dialecticorum inquisitio absit; hoc sola fides probat et agnoscit, quia cibus hominum fit cibus angelorum. Quod sacerdos elevat, non deponit. Elevatum et depositum idem videntur esse in specie, colore, et sapore: prorsus tamen aliud apparet, et aliud intrinsecus latet. Elevatus est de altari panis communis, deponitur caro Christi immortalis. Quod erat cibus animalis, factum est cibus spiritalis. Quod erat momentanea refectio hominum, factum est aeterna et indeficiens saturitas angelorum.

P. L. clxxii., 1292–1293.

Hugo of St. Victor. †1141 A.D.

Speculum de Mysteriis Ecclesiae

Latet homines et angelos quomodo verba et mystica signa crucis provehant dona oblata. Dum enim rogat

Dominum ut placatus oblationem accipiat et quibusdam aliis interpositis rogat, ut dignetur facere oblationem *benedictam*, hoc est ut promoveat in melius, *ascriptam*, hoc est sibi propriam, *ratam*, hoc est ut sufficiens sit ad salutem, *rationabilem et acceptabilem*, hoc est ut ipse recte dividat et Dominum placare possit, rogat. Et hoc totum confertur in illis verbis Domini in coena prolatis quae sacerdos subjungit. Sed ea dicturus sic prius incipit: *Qui pridie quam pateretur.* In his verbis sumit ab altari panem adhuc communem et elevatum benedicit et signum crucis imprimit, et prius quam deponat repraesentat verba Domini dum dicit: *Benedixit et fregit* et quae sequuntur. Postea tollit calicem et signat, et repraesentat verba Domini dicens: *Et dedit discipulis suis dicens: Accipite et bibite ex hoc omnes.* Hic fit illud insigne miraculum. In his verbis cibus carnis fit cibus animae. Per haec verba et per crucis signaculum novatur natura, et panis fit caro et vinum sanguis. Unde merito cum venitur ad haec verba in quibus tanta gratia datur, sacerdos tollit alte utrumque, significans hunc cibum et hunc potum excellentiorem caeteris. P. L. clxxvii., 370.

Alger of Liège. † c. 1131 A.D.

De Sacramentis Corporis et Sanguinis Dominici. Lib. I., Cap. xiv.

Unde etiam sacerdos vice Christi corpus Dominicum in terreno altari conficiens nec tamen aliquid suis meritis, sed totum divinae potentiae et gratiae attribuens, orat in canone Deum Patrem dicens: Jube haec oblata tibi per manus et virtutem Filii tui, angeli tui, qui est angelus magni consilii, non in hoc humile et visibile altare ubi modo est, sed in sublime altare tuum, id est Filium tuum, quem usque ad dexteram tuam in conspectu majestatis tuae sublimasti, deferri; ut fiat nobis corpus et sanguis dilecti Filii tui: ostendens ipsum Filium, jussione Patris, in coelis esse offerentem, et hostiam, et id super quod offertur; quia omnino fidei et gratiae ejus innitimur, quod

terrena corpora in Christum converti, ipsumque in coelestibus ad dexteram Patris sedentem, pro nobis interpellare, et in sacramento altaris consecrari et esse credimus.

P. L. clxxx., 781.

Rupert of Deutz. †1135 A.D.

Commentaria in Joannem. Lib. VI.

Panis iste corporeus, postquam signaverit eum Pater, et vinum hoc expressum acinis praesentibus, mox ut eodem signo signatum est, per manus Ecclesiae dicentis: *Ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissime Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, etc., usque *in mei memoriam facietis:* corpus et sanguis ejus qui hujus traditionis auctor est.

P. L. clxix., 466.

Peter Lombard. †1164 A.D.

Sententiarum Libri IV.

Lib. IV., dist. viii. 3. De forma

Forma vero est quam ipse ibidem edidit dicens, *Hoc est corpus meum*, et post, *Hic est sanguis meus*. Cum enim haec verba proferuntur, conversio fit panis et vini in substantiam corporis, et sanguinis Christi, reliqua ad laudem Dei dicuntur. P. L. cxcii., 856.

Lib. IV., dist. xiii. 1

Quod etiam Augustinus (?) in sermone de corpore Christi, tradere videtur dicens: Recolite nomen, et advertite veritatem. Missa enim dicitur, eo quod coelestis nuntius ad consecrandum vivificum corpus adveniat, juxta dictum sacerdotis dicentis: *Omnipotens Deus, jube haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum*, etc. Idcirco nisi angelus venerit, missa nequaquam jure vocari potest. Numquid enim si hoc mysterium haereticus ausus fuerit usurpare, angelum de coelo mittit Deus oblationem ejus consecrare?

P. L. cxcii., 868.

Sicard, Bishop of Cremona. † 1215 A.D.

Mitrale, seu, De Officiis Ecclesiasticis Summa. Lib. III., Cap. vi.

Quam oblationem: hic accedit ad Domini consecrationem dicens: *Quam oblationem*, id est terrenam materiam ad corpus tui Filii destinatam, *tu Deus quaesumus, in omnibus;* hoc est tota cogitatione, tota vita et toto intellectu, *digneris facere benedictam*, id est Spiritu sancto replere.

P. L. ccxiii., 128.

Qui pridie, id est priori die *quam pateretur, accepit panem, benedixit, fregit, dedit discipulis, et ait: Accipite et manducate, hoc est corpus meum.* Hoc tragicis gestibus quod littera sonat, exprimimus. P. L. ccxiii., 128.

Quod sacerdos panem levat, significat cibum esse caeteris excellentiorem. Similiter de potu . . . unde et sacerdos hic calicem deponit, sed non derelinquit, dicens: *Hic est calix sanguinis mei.* P. L. ccxiii., 129, 130.

Dicente vero sacerdote: *Per omnia saecula saeculorum*, diaconus calicem sublevat . . . et post in altari deponit, et cum corporali cooperit oblatam et calicem. . . . sacerdos qui oblatam elevat. P. L. ccxiii., 134.

Durandus, Bishop of Mende. † 1296 A.D.

Rationale Divinorum Officiorum. Lib. IV., Cap. xliv.

Possunt etiam secundo modo praemissa verba sic exponi: Omnipotens Deus, *jube haec*, scilicet panem et vinum, *perferri*, id est transmutari, *in sublime altare tuum*, id est in corpus et sanguinem filii tui, super choros angelorum exaltari, quia corpus Domini dictum est altare juxta illud: *Altare de terra facietis mihi, per manum sancti Angeli tui*, id est per ministerium sacerdotis.

Neapoli, 1859, p. 280.

The Ancient Statutes of the Carthusians. c. 1150 A.D.

Part I., cap. 43, De officio sacerdotis, diaconi, et subdiaconi (Martene, De Ant. Eccl. Rit., Lib. I., Cap. IV., Art. XII., Ordo XXV.).

Dicta praefatione, inclinatur sacerdos ante faciem altaris, et dicit: *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,* et cetera, *Te igitur* et cetera usque *benedicas.* Tunc erigit se, et facit cruces sicut dispositae sunt in missali. Ad *Qui pridie quam pateretur,* cum dicit: *Accepit panem,* accipit hostiam utraque manu, elevat parum, et suo loco benedicit. Si autem plures sint hostiae, dicendo *Benedixit,* uno signaculo signat tam ipsam quam tenet, quam ceteras. Dicto autem *Hoc est Corpus meum,* elevatur hostia, ita ut possit videri, et pulsatur campana uno ictu aut pluribus in missis tantum conventualibus. Porro in elevatione hostiae, si stantes oramus, ad terram prosternimur, sicut quando dicitur: *Et homo factus est,* nec surgimus donec calix deponatur. . . . Ad *Simili modo* cum dicitur *Accipiens et hunc praeclarum calicem,* accipit calicem utraque manu, elevat parum, primum retractis paulisper corporalibus et restrictis inter digitos et oram calicis, ne decidant; dicto *Gratias agens,* deponit, sed manum sinistram non removet. Facta autem cruce ad *Benedixit,* iterum resumit utraque manu calicem, et elevat parum, elevatum tenet usque *Unde et memores Domine.* p. 228.

Odonis Episcopi Parisiensis Synodicae Constitutiones. 1197 A.D.

Cap. V. 6. Frequenter moneantur laici, ut ubicumque viderint deferri corpus Domini, statim genua flectant tanquam Domino et Creatori suo, et junctis manibus, quoad usque transierit, orent. Mansi, XXII., 678.

Communia Praecepta Synodalia.

28. Praecipitur presbyteris, ut cum in canone Missae incoeperint, *Qui pridie,* tenentes hostiam, ne elevent eam statim nimis alte, ita quod possit ab omnibus videri a

populo, sed quasi ante pectus detineant, donec dixerint: *Hoc est corpus meum:* et tunc elevent eam, ut possit ab omnibus videri. Mansi, XXII., 682.

Additiones Willelmi Parisiensis Episcopi ad Constitutiones Gallonis. 1208 A.D.

XV. Ut elevatione corporis Christi campana pulsetur.

Praecipitur, quod in celebratione Missarum, quando corpus Christi elevatur, in ipsa elevatione, vel paulo ante, campana pulsetur, sicut alias fuit statutum: ut sic mentes fidelium ad orationem excitentur. Mansi, XXII., 768.

Constitutiones Ricardi Poore, Sarum Episcopi. c. 1217 A.D.

XXXVII. Moneantur laici, quod reverenter se habeant in consecratione Eucharistiae, et flectant genua: maxime in tempore illo, cum post elevationem Eucharistiae hostia sacra dimittitur. Mansi, XXII., 1119.

Honorii Papae III. ad Praelatos Hiberniae. 1219 A.D.

Sacerdos vero quilibet frequenter doceat plebem suam, ut cum in celebratione missarum elevatur hostia salutaris, quilibet reverenter inclinet, idem faciens cum ipsam portat presbyter ad infirmum. Mansi, XXII., 1100.

Concilium Oxoniense. 1222 A.D.

Cap. XXIII. Quod archidiaconi in visitatione sua examinent sacerdotes de canone Missae, et de sacramento altaris.

Ut autem archidiaconi secundum Apostolum, non quae sua sunt quaerant, sed quae Jesu Christi, in sua visitatione provideant, ut canon Missae emendetur, si sint in eo defectus: et quod sacerdotes rite proferre noverint saltem verba canonis et baptismatis, et quod in hac parte sanum habeant intellectum. Mansi, XXII., 1159.

Statuta Legenda in Concilio Oxoniensi. 1222 A.D.

Edita per dom. Stephanum Langton: Cantuar. Archiepiscopum.

Frequenter moneantur laici, ut ubicumque videant corpus Domini deferri, statim genua flectant tamquam

creatori et redemptori suo, et junctis manibus, quousque transierit, orent humiliter, et hoc maxime fiat tempore consecrationis in elevatione hostiae quum panis in verum corpus Christi transformatur, et id, quod est in calice, in sui sanguinem mystica benedictione transformatur. Verba canonis missae, praesertim in his, quae ad substantiam sacramenti pertinent, plene et integre, et cum summa animi devotione proferantur. Mansi, XXII., 1175–1176.

Concilium Provinciale Scoticum. 1225 A.D.

Statuta Generalia Ecclesiae Scoticanae

LVIII. *De Sacramento Eucharistiae.*

Item praecipimus, ut sacerdotes habeant canonem correctum, et verba canonis in missa rotunde dicantur et distincte.

LIX. *De Celebratione Missarum.*

Hostiam vero non elevent antequam ista verba praedicantur: *Hoc est corpus meum.* Mansi, XXII., 1239.

Concilium Trevirense Provinciale. 1227 A.D.

III. *Sequitur de Eucharistia.*

Corpus Domini cum campanula et lucerna, et luminibus honorifice, et decenter portetur infirmis, item doceantur laici a sacerdote genua flectere, pectus pungere, manus jungere, dum sacramentum Eucharistiae sic portatur ad infirmos. . . . Item hostia ante transubstantiationis verba non elevetur ad populum. Mansi, XXIII., 27.

Praecepta Antiqua seu Institutorum Synodalium dioecesis Rotomagensis a Sacerdotibus observandum opusculum, etc. 1235 A.D.

IX. Praecipitur Presbyteris ut quando inceperint in Canone Missae, *Qui pridie,* tenentes hostiam non elevent eam: sed ante pectus detineant, donec dixerint: *Hoc est enim corpus meum.* Et tunc reverenter elevent eam et decenter, ita possit videri. Mansi, XXIII., 374.

Synodus Wigorniensis. 1240 A.D.

Constitutiones Walteri de Cantilupo Wigorniensis Episcopi

VIII. Cum autem, in celebratione Missae, Corpus Domine per manus sacerdotum in altum erigitur, campanella pulsetur; ut per hoc devotio torpentium excitetur, ac aliorum caritas fortius inflammetur. Quod autem a religiosis illis, quoad elevationem, ut videri possit ab astantibus observari praecipimus, qui non servaverunt, ut dicitur, hactenus hoc statutum. Mansi, XXIII., 528.

Statuta Synodalia Walteris et Simonis Norwicensium Episcoporum. 1257 A.D.

Sacerdos vero quilibet frequenter doceat plebem suam, ut cum in celebratione missarum elevatur hostia salutaris, se reverenter inclinet. Mansi, XXIII., 965.

Concilium Provinciale Moguntinum. 1261 A.D.

Canon VI. Sacerdos vero quilibet plebem suam doceat diligenter, ut cum in celebratione missarum elevatur hostia salutaris, quilibet devote flectat genua sua, vel saltem se reverenter inclinet, idem faciens cum eam portat Presbyter ad infirmum. Mansi, XXIII., 1082.

Statuta Synodalia Claromontensis Ecclesiae. 1268 A.D.

Capitula, Pars I., vi. Si vero per negligentiam evenit, quod perlecto canone, et peracta consecratione corporis nec vinum nec aqua reperiantur in calice, debet statim infundi in calice utrumque; et hostia sic consecrata seorsum reverenter observetur. Hostia nova, sicut nunc solet, ante calicem apponatur, et reincipiatur canon Missae, *Te igitur*. Post communionem vero, ante sumptionem sanguinis, prior hostia ab ipso sacerdote sumatur. Mansi, XXIII., 1191.

Et presbyteri, quando incipiunt in canone Missae. *Qui pridie quam pateretur*, hostiam non elevent; sed teneant ante pectus decenter, donec dixerint, *Hoc est enim*

corpus meum: et tunc elevent eam, et elevatam tamdiu teneant, quod possit apte videri: et tunc pulsetur campana. Hoc autem dictum est, ne purus panis adoretur: quod esset, si ante prolationem verborum istorum hostia elevaretur. Mansi, XXIII., 1191.

Concilium Monasteriense in Westphalia. 1279 A.D.

VIII. Praecipimus ut sacerdotes attente, reverenter, et distincte legant, et dicant in Canone, quae sunt dicenda: et expediant se, quantorcius poterunt, propter taedium astantium, et alia, quae occurrere possunt: et faciant signa sua distincte, et reverenter. Item nullus Sacerdos elevet hostiam ad ostendendum populo, nisi postquam dixerit haec verba. *Hoc est enim corpus meum:* et pulsetur campana tribus vicibus, ut fideles qui audierint, ubicumque fuerint, adorent.

Item, si Sacerdos cum venerit ad consecrationem sanguinis, vel etiam ad perceptionem, et nihil in calicem inveniat, innuat, ut ei afferatur vinum, et aqua: dicat verba canonis ab illo loco: *Simili modo, postquam coenatum,*[1] usque ad finem, et faciat signa, quae fieri solent super sanguinem: illa autem, quae facta sunt super Eucharistiam, non reiteret, sed transeat consueto modo.

Mansi, XXIV., 314.

Synodus Coloniensis. 1280 A.D.

VII. *De sacramento eucharistiae sive altaris.*

Item nullus sacerdos elevet hostiam ad ostendendum populo, nisi postquam dixerit haec verba: *Hoc est enim corpus meum.* Et pulsetur nola tribus ictibus ex una parte, ut fideles qui audierint, ubicumque fuerint, veniant et adorent. Mansi, XXIV., 350.

[1] Note the more conservative and primitive idea of consecration expressed by the directions of the Council of Clermont, as compared with those of the Council of Munster. With the first compare the extract from *Preparatio Sacerdotis*, prefixed to a Roman Missal of 1493 (see below, p. 405), which bids the priest begin as far back as *Hanc igitur* under similar circumstances.

Synodus Exoniensis. 1287 A.D.

IV. *De Eucharistia.*

Quia vero per haec verba, *hoc est enim corpus meum*, et non per alia, panis transubstantiatur in corpus Christi: prius hostiam non levet sacerdos, donec ipsa plene protulerit verba, ne pro Creatore, creatura a populo veneretur.

Hostia autem ita levetur in altum, ut a fidelibus circumstantibus valeat intueri; per hoc enim fidelium devotio excitatur, et fides meritum suscipit incrementum. Parochiani vero sollicite exhortantur, ut in elevatione corporis Christi, nedum reverenter inclinent, sed genua flectant, et Creatorem suum adorent, omni devotione et reverentia, ad quod per campanellae pulsationem primitus excitentur: et in elevatione ter tangatur campana major.

Mansi, XXIV., 788.

Ordo Romanus XIV. 1342–1352 A.D.

Mabillon, Mus. Ital., ii., p. 243 seq.

Ordinarium Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae, auctore, ut videtur, Jacobo Gaietano cardinale

LIII. . . . Subsequenter manibus junctis inclinatus ante altare incipiat submissa voce, *Te igitur*, etc., et cum dicet, *uti accepta habeas*, erigat se, et osculetur altare in parte sinistra prope hostiam. Deinde prosequatur ipsum canonem, sicut in libro habetur, faciendo signum crucis super calicem et hostiam similiter, quando dicit, *haec dona*, et iterum quando dicit, *haec munera*, et iterum quando dicit, *haec sancta sacrificia illibata*. Cum autem dixerit, *Memento Domine famulorum famularumque tuarum*, subsistat modicum a prolatione verborum, et mente habeat coram Deo memoriam vivorum pro quibus orare intendit: et post paululum resumat illud, *et omnium circumstantium*, etc.

Cumque pervenerit ad illum locum, *Quam oblationem*, etc., faciat signum crucis super calicem et hostiam; similiter dicendo, *benedictam*, et iterum dicendo, *ascrip-*

tam, et tertio dicendo, *ratam*, etc., et cum dicet, *ut nobis corpus*, faciat signum super hostiam tantum. Similiter cum dicit, *sanguis*, faciat crucem super calicem tantum: dicendo autem, *dilectissimi filii*, etc., junctis manibus ad pectus suscipiat paulisper in altum. Deinde dicendo, *Qui pridie*, etc., tergat paululum super corporale utriusque manus pollicem et indicem, et accipiat cum ipsis digitis hostiam; nec multum elevet super ipsum altare: dicendo autem, *elevatis oculis in caelum*, elevet ipsos oculos; et dicendo, *benedixit*, faciat cum dextra manu signum crucis super hostiam, quam teneat manu sinistra: quo facto, iterum teneat hostiam cum digitis utriusque manus, et proferat distincte ac devote verba consecrationis: quibus dictis, ipse primo adoret inclinato capite sacrum divinum corpus: deinde reverenter et attente ipsum elevet in altum adorandum a populo, et adoratam sacram hostiam deponet in loco suo. Et attendat quod ex tunc utriusque manus pollicem cum indice junctum teneat, nec disjungat ipsos digitos usque post communionem, nisi quando ipsum oportet contingere sacram hostiam, vel signa facere.

Deposita hostia, ut dictum est, dicendo: *Simili modo*, etc., accipiat calicem ipsum discoopertum, ut prius teneat cum utraque manu paulisper elevatum super altare, et cum dicit, *benedixit*, deposito super altare calice, faciat super ipsum calicem crucem cum dextra manu, tenendo eum cum sinistra, quo facto, resumens cum utraque manu, et elevans paululum ab altare, prosequatur verba consecrationis usque ad illum locum, *remissionem peccatorum*. Quibus finitis, inclinato paululum capite adoret sacrum Domini sanguinem, et elevet adorandum a populo, ut supra de corpore dictum est. Nec oportet quod vel corpus, vel sanguinem diu teneat elevatum; sed post brevem moram deponat, ita tamen quod elevationes et depositiones faciat cum debita reverentia et maturitate. Deponendo autem calicem dicat haec verba: *Haec quotiescumque*, etc. Deposito calice, et collocato in loco suo,

elevatis manibus ut prius, prosequatur illud: *Unde et memores*, etc. Et cum dicet, *hostiam puram*, faciat signum crucis super calicem et hostiam simul; et iterum faciat dicendo *hostiam sanctam*, et iterum faciat dicendo, *hostiam immaculatam;* et cum dicet, *panem sanctum vitae aeternae*, faciat signum super hostiam tantum. Similiter cum dicit, *et calicem salutis perpetuae*, faciat signum super calicem tantum. Cum autem dicet: *Supplices te rogamus*, etc., manibus cancellatis ante pectus, ita quod dextrum brachium sit supra sinistrum, inclinet ante altare: et cum dicturus est: *ex hac altaris participatione*, etc., erigit se, et osculetur altare in sinistra parte prope hostiam. Subsequenter dicendo, *sacrosanctum*, etc., faciat signum crucis super hostiam, et aliud faciat super calicem dicendo, *et sanguinem.* Cumque dicet, *omni benedictione*, etc., signet faciem suam. Cum autem dixerit, *Memento*, etc., faciat memoriam pro defunctis, sicut superius de vivis dictum est. Et cum pervenerit ad illud, *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, etc., dicendo, *nobis*, elevet paululum vocem sine nota, et percutiat pectus suum cum digitis dextrae manus, non pollice et indice, sed aliis. Deinde prosequatur quae scripta sunt usque ad illum locum, *per quem omnia*, etc., et dicendo, *sanctificas*, faciat signum super calicem et hostiam similiter, et iterum faciat dicendo, *vivificas*, et tertio dicendo, *benedicis.* Post haec diaconus detegat calicem, amovendo corporale quod ipsum tegit, et ipsum calicem per pedem teneat firmum cum digitis dextrae manus: et tunc idem Pontifex cum reverentia recipiat corpus Domini cum dextra manu, et faciat cum eo signum crucis super ora calicis a labio usque ad labium, dicendo, *per ipsum;* idem faciat signum paululum juxta calicem, dicendo, *et in ipso.* Cumque dicet, *est tibi Deo*, etc., faciat cum eadem hostia signum crucis inter se et calicem contra labium calicis, et iterum faciat signum contra pedem ipsius calicis, dicendo, *in unitate Spiritus sancti*, etc. Quo facto, deponat ipsam hostiam

in loco suo, et diaconus tegat cum corporali, ac osculetur altare et dextrum humerum Pontificis, et sic redeat ad locum suum post Pontificem. Pp. 304–306.

Duns Scotus

Quaestiones in Librum Quartum Sententiarum. Distinctio 8, q. 2

Sed hic est dubium, utrum praetermissis verbis praecedentibus, per ista sola quatuor verba conficeret Sacerdos. Dicitur quod sic, quia ista sunt praecisa forma, alia sunt propter reverentiam, vel propter orationem praemittenda. Sed contra istud arguitur, quia verba sacramentalia ex vi verborum debent significare illud, quod efficitur, ex vi Sacramenti; sed ex vi consecrationis hujus efficitur ibi esse verum corpus Christi; ergo verba sufficientia ex vi propria debent significare illud ibi contineri. Sed haec verba: *Hoc est corpus meum*, prolata sine praecedentibus, hoc non significant absolute, quia ly *meum* significat referri ad personam ipsius loquentis, quia licet minister possit intendere, ut loquatur in persona Christi, non tamen propter hoc, significatum illorum verborum esset, quod ly *meum* demonstraret corpus Christi sed corpus loquentis. Sicut si inciperem loqui in persona Christi, dicendo sic, mea doctrina est ista, sed intenderem loqui in persona Christi, tamen ex vi verborum non habetur quod ista doctrina sit Christi, sed illius qui loquitur; sicut Angelus quando loquebatur in persona Dei: *Ego sum Deus Abraham*, et per consequens, non esset propositio falsa secundum sensum pro quo fieret; tamen non erat significatum proprie hujus orationis, quod ly *ego* supponeret pro persona Dei.

Hoc etiam confirmatur per Ambrosium *de consecrat. dist.* 2. Panis est in altari: *Sermo*, inquit, *Christi creaturam mutat;* et sequitur: *Consecratio quibus verbis fit? attendite, quae sunt verba: Accipite, et edite ex hoc omnes, hoc est corpus meum.* Ubi ipse videtur conjungere illa verba praecedentia, scilicet *accipite*, tanquam verba consecrationis. Sed hoc non est intelligendum tanquam sint essen-

tialiter pertinentia ad necessitatem consecrationis, tanquam necessario praemittenda; et non solum illa, sed alia plura praecedentia in canone, ex quibus ex vi sermonis haberi potest, quod ista; *Hoc est corpus meum*, dicuntur in persona Christi. Unde non sine causa Ecclesia ita connexit totum Canonem Missae, quod ab illo loco *Communicantes*, usque ad illum locum post consecrationem: *Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus*, non est aliqua oratio, quae non necessario connectatur cum praecedente, vel per conjunctionem copulativam, sicut: *Hanc ergo oblationem*, et hujusmodi, vel per pronomen infinitum, ut, *Quam oblationem tu Deus*, et *Qui pridie quam pateretur*, et post consecrationem: *Supra quae propitio;* vel per relationem, ut ibi: *Simili modo.* De isto articulo dicetur in generali simul cum dubiis, quid fuerit observandum.

Pp. 36, 37, vol. xvii. Vivès, Paris, 1891–1895.

Quod ergo consilium? Dico, quod Sacerdos intendens facere quod facit Ecclesia, legens distincte verba Canonis a principio usque ad finem, vere conficit; nec est tutum alicui se reputare valde peritum de scientia sua, et dicere: Volo uti praecise istis verbis pro consecratione sanguinis; sed securior est simplicitas: Volo ista verba proferre sub ea intentione, sub qua Christus instituit ea esse proferenda, ut quae ex Christi institutione sunt de forma, dico ut de forma, et quae ad reverentiam, ad reverentiam.

Sed quid si ante omnia verba prolata contingeret mori Sacerdotem, numquid habendus esset sanguis tanquam vere consecratus? Dico hic, sicut in quodam casu superius praemisso, si quis Sacerdos incipieret sic loqui: *Hoc est corpus meum*, non praedicens verba praemissa totaliter, quod omnibus talibus non est adorandum nisi sub conditione, si vere consecratum est.

Pp. 51, 52, vol. xvii. Vivès, Paris, 1891–1895.

Preparatio Sacerdotis

Missale Romanum, Venetiis, 1493

Restat inquirere de omissionibus vel negligentijs que circa missam solent contingere qualiter de huiusmodi sit agendum. . . . Si ante verba transubstantiationis scilicet *Hic est calix.* celebrans hoc perpenderit debet mitti vinum si solum omissum fuerit vel utrumque si fuerit omissum et ita procedat in consecratione. Si vero post verba transubstantiationis et quasi cum ventum est ad sumptionem hoc perpenderit quia apud aliquos magistros dubium est utrum confectio in una specie possit fieri sine confectione in alia specie: licet plures non dubitent quin bene fiat et possit fieri: ponat hostiam illam in sequestri altaris cum magna reverentia: et in fine misse sumatur a ministro vel ab alio ad hoc preparato: premissaque confessione sacerdos ministret denuo panem et vinum et aquam: si aqua in calice non fuerit et reincipiat ab illo loco canonis scilicet: *Hanc igitur oblationem,* &c.

. . . Si ante transubstantiationem effusa fuerit pars vini aliqua: mutetur palla sub silentio: et sic celebrans officium prosequatur.

Si totum effusum fuerit: mutatis lintheaminibus ministret denuo et reincipiat ab *Hanc igitur* premissa tamen confessione.

Si post transubstantiationem effusa fuerit pars sanguinis: nihilominus celebrans officium prosequatur. Si totum quod nihil omnino remanserit: quod est valde difficile ponat super propitiatorium et ministret denuo panem et vinum et aquam: et reincipiat ab *Hanc igitur.* Confessione premissa: et sumatur prima hostia a ministro vel ab infirmo: vel ab alio ad hoc parato.

Tracts on the Mass, p. 116.[1]

[1] This tract is also found in other later editions of the Roman Missal. See Dr. Wickham Legg's Introduction, pp. xxiv–xxv.

Ordo Missae

John Burckard, Rome, 1502

Qui pridie quam pateretur. accipit cum pollice et indice dextre manus hostiam: et eam cum illis: ac pollice et indice etiam sinistre manus tenens: stans erectus ante medium altaris dicit.

accepit panem: in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas Elevat ad deum oculos: et sine mora demittit dicens.

et elevatis oculis in celum ad te deum patrem suum omnipotentem: tibi gratias agens.

tenet hostiam inter pollicem et indicem sinistre manus: et dextra producit semel signum Crucis super eam dicens.

bene✠dixit fregit deditque discipulis suis dicens: Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes.

discooperit manu dextera calicem seu vas aliarum hostiarum: si sit et cubitis super altare positis: stans inclinato capite: verba consecrationis distincte secrete: et reverenter profert super hostiam et simul super omnes: si plures sunt consecrande: et hostiam suam tantum pollicibus et indicibus tenet dicens.

Hoc est enim corpus meum.

His dictis celebrans hostiam inter pollices et indices super altare tenens; reliquis manuum digitis extensis ac binis et binis simul iunctis: et ceteris hostijs si sunt plures consecrate in loco in quo a principio misse sunt posite super corporali: vel in alio calice sive vase dimissis genuflexus eam adorat: Tum se erigit elevat in altum quantum commode potest hostiam: et populo ostendit reverenter adorandam: et mox ipsam veneranter super Corporale reponit unde eam levavit: et pollices ac indices non disiungit usque post communionem: nisi quando hostiam consecratam tangere vel tractare debet et infra dicetur. Tum usque in terram genuflexus hostiam ipsam veneratur: et calicem seu vas aliarum hostiarum si sit: sua patena

cooperit. . . . Deinde celebrans discooperit Calicem: et pollices ac indices super illius labium aliquantulum tergit: et eos iterum iungit: et stans erectus dicit secrete.

Simili modo posteaquam cenatum est.

Ambabus manibus accipit Calicem iuxta nodum infra cuppam Calicis: illum aliquantulum elevat: et sine mora reponit in eundem locum de quo eum levavit: super Corporale: interim prosequens.

accipiens et hunc preclarum calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas item tibi gratias agens.

tenet Calicem manu sinistra per nodum infra Cuppam: dextra vero signando super eum dicit.

Bene✠dixit: deditque discipulis suis dicens. Accipite et bibite ex eo omnes.

Accipit ambabus manibus Calicem videlicet cum sinistra pedem: cum dextera vero nodum infra cuppam Calicis: et cubitis super Altare positis: stans inclinato capite: super Calicem secrete: distincte: et reverenter verba consecrationis profert dicens.

Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei novi et eterni testamenti misterium fidei: qui pro nobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionum peccatorum.

reponit Calicem super Corporale dicens secrete.

Hoc quotienscumque feceritis: in mei memoriam facietis.

Et genuflexus sanguinem reverenter adorat: tum se erigit: accipit calicem discoopertum cum sanguine ambabus manibus ut prius; elevat eum quantum commode potest: illum populo ostendens adorandum: et mox ipsum reverenter reponit super corporale: in locum solitum: et manu dextera ipsum palla cooperit: et genuflexus sacramentum veneratur. . . .

Tum celebrans ut prius ante altare extensis manibus ante pectus more consueto dicit secrete.

Unde et memores.

Tracts on the Mass, pp. 156–158.

Indutus Planeta

Missale Romanum, F. Fradin, Lugduni, 1507

De inclinationibus

Item nota quod primo inclinat se sacerdos ante gradum altaris in confessione ut predictum est.

. . . Quarto cum dicit *Te igitur.*

Quinto cum dicit *Supplices te rogamus omnipotens deus.*

. . . Et sciendum quod iste inclinationes profunde fiunt coram altari. Sunt etiam alie inclinationes que fiunt mediocriter super altare.

. . . Septima post consecrationem hostie antequam elevetur.

Tracts on the Mass, p. 182.

Cum vero perventum est ad *Qui pridie.* ductis plane digitis super pallam altaris accipit ibi ostiam dicens. *Accepit panem.* Et parum elevans signat eam dicens. *Benedicit.* Et dicto *Hoc est corpus meum.* Et adorato corpore domini cum mediocri inclinatione elevat illud reverenter ita quod a circunstantibus possit videri: postea deponit in loco suo. Deinde coopertum calicem accipit cum duabus manibus et parum elevat dicens. *Accipiens et hunc preclarum calicem* etc. Deponit iterum super altare dicens. *Item tibi gratias agens.* Deinde signat dicens. *Benedicit.* Et iterato elevans dicit. *Accipite et bibite* etc. usque *in mei commemorationem facietis.*

Deinde deposito calice dicit. *Unde et memores.*

Tracts on the Mass, p. 186.

Directorium Divinorum Officiorum,

Ludovicus Ciconiolanus, Rome, 1539

De quibusdam inclinationibus

Decreveram nihil de inclinationibus agere cum in ordinario de eis tractetur. Sed cum multos videam sacerdotes post consecrationem quoties opus fuerit, parum tanto domino inclinari, non possum non gravato, męstoque

ferre animo. Si temporalibus dominis magna exhibetur reverentia quanto longe maior ęterno, universalique domino exhiberi debet? Ideo genuflexiones post consecrationem profundissime fieri condecet. Loquor sanis, et iuvenibus, non ęgrotis, et senibus.

Tracts on the Mass, p. 215.

Roman Missal, Paris, Iolande Bonhomme, Widow of Thielmann Kerver, 1555

Rubrics of *Qui pridie:*

Before F 1: Cum autem perventum fuerit ad *Qui pridie quam pateretur* ductis plane digitis super pallam, accipit hostiam in manibus, dicendo *accepit panem* etc. et illam utraque manu tenens inter pollices et indices dicendo *et elevatis* sursum elevat oculos, et signat hostiam, dicens *benedixit.*

Before F 43: Et adorato corpore domini cum mediocri inclinatione, elevat illud reverenter: et postea illud in loco suo reponit. Deinde dicens *Simili modo postquam cenatum est,* discooperit calicem: et eum utraque manu accipiens, parum elevat, dicens, *Accipiens et hunc preclarum* etc. Reponit iterum super altare, dicens. *Item ibi gratias agens,* et sinistra manu tenens ipsum, dextera signat, dicens *Benedixit* et iterum utraque manu calicem ipsum parum elevans, dicit *Accipite* etc. usque *memo. facietis.*

After F 102: Postea cum mediocri inclinatione adorato preciosissimo sanguine xpi, utraque manu calicem ipsum reverenter elevat coopertum. Postea reponit in loco suo. Et genibus in terram positis junctis manibus, et inclinato capite, dominicum corpus et

sanguinem reverenter adorat. Deinde surgens extensis aliquantulum brachiis: dicit *Unde et memo.*

Roman Missal. 1573

(Antverpiae excudebat Christophorus Plantinus)

Rubrics of the Canon:

Before A 1: Sacerdos extendens et jungens manus, elevans ad caelum oculos et statim demittens, inclinatus ante altare dicit.

Before A 16: Osculatur altare.

Before A 21: Signet ter super oblata.

Before A 29: Extensis manibus prosequitur.

Before B 1: Commemoratio pro vivis.

Before B 6: N. jungit manus, orat aliquantulum pro quibus orare intendit: deinde extensis manibus prosequitur.

Before C 1: Infra actionem.

Before C 77: Jungit manus.

Before D 1: Tenens manus extensas super oblata dicit.

Before D 35: Jungit manus.

Before E 8: Signat ter super oblata.

Before E 15: Signat semel super hostiam, et semel super calicem.

Before F 5: Accipit hostiam.

Before F 13: Elevat oculos ad caelum.

Before F 26: Signat super hostiam.

Before F 38: Tenens ambabus manibus hostiam, profert verba consecrationis distincte, secrete, et attente.

Before F 43: Prolatis verbis consecrationis, statim hostiam consecratam genuflexus adorat: surgit, ostendit populo: reponit super corporale, iterum adorat: et non disjungit pollices et indices, nisi quando hostia tractanda est, usque ad ablutionem digitorum. Tunc detecto calice dicit.

Before F 48: Ambabus manibus accipit calicem.
Before F 63: Sinistra tenens calicem, dextera signat super eum.
Before F 74: Profert verba consecrationis super calicem, tenens illum parum elevatum.
Before F 96: Prolatis verbis consecrationis, deponit calicem super corporale, et genuflexus adorat: surgit et ostendit populo: dicens.
Before G 1: Deponit, cooperit, et iterum adorat. Deinde disjunctis manibus dicit.
Before G 43: Signat ter super hostiam et calicem simul.
Before G 49: Signat semel super hostiam, et semel super calicem.
Before H 1: Extensis manibus prosequitur.
Before I 1: Profunde inclinatus junctis manibus dicit.
Before I 24: Osculatur Altare.
Before I 31: Signat semel super hostiam, et semel super calicem.
Before I 35: Seipsum signat.
Before J 1: Commemoratio pro Defunctis.
Before J 18: N. jungit manus, orat aliquantulum pro his Defunctis pro quibus orare intendit: deinde extensis manibus prosequitur.
Before K 1: Percutit pectus, elata parum voce dicens.
Before L 9: Signat ter super hostiam et calicem simul dicens.
Before L 15: Discooperit calicem, genuflectit, accipit Sacramentum dextera, tenens sinistra calicem: signat cum hostia a labio ad labium calicis dicens.
Before L 23: Bis signat inter pectus et calicem.
Before L 32: Elevans parum calicem cum hostia dicit.
Before L 36: Reponit hostiam, cooperit calicem, genuflectit, surgit et dicit.
After L 40: Jungit manus.

Pp. 289–294.

The Sarum Customary. End of Fourteenth Century

Chapter 66, § 28

Rubrics of D, E, and F:

Before D 1: Hic respiciat sacerdos hostiam cum magna veneracione dicens.

Before E 1: Hic iterum respiciat hostiam dicens.

Before F 1: Hic erigat sacerdos manus et conjungat, et postea tergat digitos et elevet hostiam dicens.

Before F 24: Hic inclinet se et postea elevet paululum dicens.

Before F 28: Hic tangat hostiam dicens.

Before F 43: Et[1] debent ista verba proferri cum uno spiritu et sub una prolacione, nulla pausacione interposita: post hec verba inclinet se sacerdos ad hostiam et postea elevet eam supra frontem, ut possit a populo videri et reverenter reponat illud super corporalia ante calicem in modum crucis per eandem facte. [Et tunc discooperiat calicem] et teneat inter manus suas, non disjungendo pollicem ab indice, nisi dum facit benedicciones tantum, ita dicens.

Before F 61: Hic inclinet se sacerdos dicens.

Before F 74: Hic elevet [sacerdos] parumper calicem dicens.

Before F 96: [Hic elevet calicem usque pectus vel ultra capud dicens.]

After F 102: Hic reponat calicem . . . et elevet brachia in modum crucis etc.

FRERE, The Use of Sarum, vol. i., pp. 80–81.

[1] N.B. In the 1554 edition of the Sarum Manual the rubric before F 43 reads: *Et debent ista verba . . . inclinet se sacerdos ad hostiam et capite inclinato illam adoret et postea,* etc.

Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt. Kirchen-Ordnung für Wittenberg. 1522

. . . Item die messen söllen nit anderst gehalten werden, dann wie si Christus am abentessen hat eingesetzt, doch umb etlicher sachen umbs glauben willen lasset man singen de tempore, und nit de sanctis, und singet introitum, kyrieleison, gloria in excelsis, et in terra, collecta, oder preces, epistel, gradualia, on sequens, evangelium, credo, offertorium, prefatio, sanctus, on canonen maior und minor, dieweil die geschrift nit gemess seind. Darnach vacht an das evangelisch mal; sein communicanten, so consecriert der priester, seind si nit da, so consecriert er und summiert es, hat er anders andacht darzu, darnach concludiert er mit der collecten, on ite missa est. Es mag auch der communicant die consecrierten hostien in die hand nemen, und selbs in den mund schieben, dergleichen auch den kelch, und daraus trinken.

(Sehling, *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, I., 1, p. 698.)

. . . Item die messe sall nicht anders gehalten werden, dan wie sie Christus eingesetzt hat, durch etliche krangken im glauben derhalben lest man nach singen Introitum, Kyrieelyson, Et in terra, Epistel, Gradual ane Sequenz, Evangelium, Credo ane opfer, Sanctus. Auch lest man beide Canones aussen, dweil sie der schrift nit gemess seindt. Hienach fahet man an zu predigen die evangelische messe. Seint Communicantes, sso cosecriert man. Es magk auch der Priester sumieren ap er will.

(*Ibid.*, note 2, pp. 697–698. The "Roth'schen" MS. of the above.)

Lyndwood's Provinciale

Lib. I., Tit. 10 in verbum *Canon Missae*

De hoc canone habes *extra. de celeb. miss. c. cum Marthae. in prin.* Ubi dicit *Hosti.* quod Canon Missae accipitur pro illis verbis Christi, quibus fit Transubstantiatio panis

in corpus, et vini in sanguinem. Licet quidam simplices sacerdotes intelligant Canonem, quicquid est in secreto missae; et stricte intelligendo Canonem, puto quod *Hostiensis* dicit verum. Est namque *Canon* idem quod regula. 3. *di. Canon.* Missa vero proprie dicitur Eucharistiae consecratio. Alia autem omnia, quae vel sacerdos dicit, vel chorus canit, gratiarum actiones sunt, vel certe obsecrationes. *de conse. di.* 2. *utrum. in fi.* Unde Canon Missae vere dicitur regula illa, per quam Eucharistia consecratur; hoc est, illorum verborum per quae panis in corpus, et vinum in sanguinem transubstantiantur.

P. 49, Oxford, 1679.

Martin Luther

Formula missae et communionis pro ecclesia Wittembergensi, 1523

. . . Octavo, sequitur tota illa abominatio, cui servire coactum est quicquid in missa praecessit, unde et offertorium vocatur. Et abhinc omnia fere sonant ac olent oblationem. In quorum medio verba illa vitae et salutis sic posita sunt ceu olim arca domini in templo idolorum iuxta Dagon. Et nullus est ibi Israelita, qui vel accedere vel arcam reducere possit, donec ipsa hostes suos in posteriora percussos opprobrio sempiterno nobilitavit et sese dimittere compulit, quae est parabola instantis temporis. Proinde omnibus illis repudiatis quae oblationem sonant, cum universo canone, retineamus, quae pura et sancta sunt, ac sic missam nostram ordiamur. . . .

. . . II. Apparato pane et vino mox procedatur ad hunc modum: 'Dominus vobiscum,' respon.: 'Et cum spiritu tuo.' 'Sursum corda,' respon.: 'Habeamus ad dominum,' 'Gratias agamus domino deo nostro.' Respon.: 'dignum et iustum est. Vere dignum et iustum est, equum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, domine sancte, pater omnipotens, aeterne deus, per Christum dominum nostrum.'

III. Deinde: 'Qui pridie quam pateretur, accepit

panem gratias agens, fregit deditque discipulis suis dicens: Accipite, comedite, hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur.

'Similiter et calicem, postquam caenavit, dicens: Hic calix est novi testamenti in meo sanguine, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Hoc quotiescunque feceritis, in mei memoriam faciatis.'

Haec verba Christi velim modica post prefationem interposita pausa in eo tono vocis recitari, quo canitur alias oratio dominica in canone, ut a circumstantibus possit audiri, quamquam in his omnibus libertas sit piis mentibus, vel silenter vel palam ea verba recitare.

IV. Finita benedictione Chorus cantet Sanctus et sub cantu Benedictus elevetur panis et calix, ritu hactenus servato, vel propter infirmos, qui hac repentina huius insignioris in missa ritus [mutatione] forte offendentur, praesertim ubi per conciones vernaculas docti fuerint, quid ea petatur elevatione.

V. Post haec legatur oratio dominica. . . .

(Sehling, *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, I., 1, pp. 5–6.)

Von der Euangelischen Messz. Mit schönen Christlichen Gebetten vor vnd nach der empfahung des Sacraments. Durch Caspar Kantz von Nördlingen. 1522.

(*Die evangelischen deutschen Messen bis zu Luthers Deutscher Messe* von D. Julius Smend, Göttingen, 1896, pp. 38–41, 72–94.)

[p. 75.] Prefation oder vorred der Mesz: Erhebt ewer herzen zu Gott und laszt uns danksagen Gott unserm herren; denn das ist billich und recht. Ja warlich ist es billich und recht, auch heylsam, das wir an allen orten und zu aller zeyt dir, herr, heyliger vatter, allmechtiger, ewiger Gott, danksagen durch Christum, unsern herren. Durch welchen alle engel und die himmelischen krefte anbetten, eeren und loben dein herrliche majestat. Mit den selbigen, bitten wir, wöllest zulassen und annemen unsere stimm,

das wir dich auch loben und sprechen on ende: Sanctus: heyliger, heyliger, heyliger herre Gott Sabaoth; voll seind hymmel und erd deiner herlichkeit. Osanna in den höchsten, gebenedeyt sey, der da kompt in dem namen des herren. Glück und heyl in den höchsten.

Nun hebt sich erst die Evangelisch Mesz an.

O aller gütigister vatter, barmherziger, ewiger Gott, hilf, das dises brot und der wein uns werde und sey der warhaftig leib und das unschuldig blut deines allerliebsten suns, unsers herren Jhesu Christi. Welcher an dem tag vor seynem leyden nam das brot in seine heiligen hende, sah auf gen hymmel zu dir, seinem allmechtigen vatter, saget dank, segnet und brach das brot, und gab es seinen jüngern, sprechende:

Nement hyn und essent. Das ist mein leyb, der für euch geben wirt. Des gleichen nach dem abentmal, nam er den kelch in sein heilige hend, danket, segnet und gab jn seinen jüngern und sprach: Nement hyn und trinkent alle daraus. Das ist der kelch des newen und ewigen testaments in meinem blut, das für euch und für vil vergossen wirt zu vergebung der sünden. Als oft jr das thut, so thuts in meiner gedechtnis.

[p. 76.] Laszt uns betten: Vatter unser, der du bist im hymmel, etc.

Eyne Evangelysce Misse: myt etlyke schone gebede/ vm eynen wech to wysen/denen die noch Kinder synt in Christo. Myt wodanen geloue vnde manire men eyne rechte Euangelische Misse be hoert to holden. Bremen. Anno. MCCCCCXXV.

Hier hevet sick erst de Evangelische Misse an.

Eyn gebet voran to Gade.

O Aldergnedigeste vader, barmhertige, ewige Got, giff uns dat wy vast gelowen, dat dit brot unde wyn wert dat waraftige lyf unde blot dynes alderlevesten sones,

unses heren Jesu Christi. Welker an deme dage vor synem lydent nam dat brot in syne hilligen hande, sach up to dem hemmel to dy, synem almechtigen vader, sede dank unde brak dat brot unde gaf dat synen iungeren sprekende:

Nemet hen unde etet; dat is myn licham, dat vor iuw gegewen wert. Des gelyken na dem aventmael nam he den kellick in syne hillige hande, dankede synen vader unde gaf synen iungeren unde sprak:

Nemet hen unde drinket alle darut. Dat is de kellick des nygen unde ewigen testamentes in mynen blode, dat vor iuw un vor vele vorgaten wert to vorgevinge der sunden. So vaken alse gy dat doet, so doet dat in myne gedechtenisse.

Dat Vader unse.

Lat uns bidden:

Unse vader, de du bist in den hemmel, etc. — [Smend, *op. cit.*, pp. 91–92.]

Ordenung vnd ynnhalt Teütscher Mesz vnd Vesper/ So yetsund im gebrauch haben Euangelisten vnd Christlichen Pfarrherren zů Strassburg. Mit etlichen Neüwen geschrifftlichen Introit, Gebet/Vorred oder Prefation vnd Canon/vor vnd nach vffhebung des Sacraments/ auch andren ordenungen /in vorigem büchlin nit begriffen. [1524.]

Wir bitten auch dich, o du aller gütigster vatter und barmherziger, ewiger Gott, das du uns helfest, das dises brot und der weyn uns werde und sei der warhaftig leyb und das unschuldig blut deyns aller liebstens suns, unsers herren Jesu Christi.

Hie facht an die recht, Christlich Mesz.

Wölcher am nechsten tag vor seym leyden das brot nam, etc.

(Smend, *op. cit.*, pp. 132, note 7, and 133, note 3. Also given in *Die Strassburger liturgischen Ordnungen im Zeitalter der Reformation* . . . von Friedrich Hubert, Göttingen, 1900, p. 68, col. 2.)

Kirchenordnung/Wie es mit der Christlichen Lehre/ heiligen Sacramenten/vnd allerley andern Ceremonien/ in meines gnedigen herrn/Herrn Otthainrichen/Pfaltzgraven bey Rhein/Hertzogen inn Nidern vnd Obern Bairn, etc. Fürstenthumb gehalten wirt. 1543.

(Colophon, fol. 86 r.) Gedruckt zu Nürenberg/durch Johan Petreium/Anno M.D.XLIII.

(Fol. 26 r.)

Nach dieser vermanung/soll der Priester vber die Hostien /vnd den Kelch/die nach anzal vnd gelegenheit der Personen/so zum heyligen Sacrament gehn wöllen/auff den Altar verordnet sein sollen/dises nachfolgendes Ge[be]t sprechen.

Gebet

Herr Iesu Christe/du eyniger warer Son des lebendigen Gottis/der du dein leib fur vns alle in den bittern tod hast dargeben/vnd dein blut zu vergebung vnserer sünde vergossen/Darzu den selben dein leib/vnd dasselbig dein blut/allen deinen Iungern zu essen vnd zu trincken/ vnd deines tods darbey zu gedencken hast befolhen. Wir bringen fur deine Götliche Maiestat/dise deine gaben/ Brot vnd Wein/vnd bitten/du wöllest die selben/ durch dein Götliche gnad/güte/vnd krafft/heiligen/ segnen/vnd schaffen/das dises Brot/dein leib/vnd diser Wein/dein blut sey/vnnd allen denen/die darvon essen vnd trincken/zum ewigen leben lassen gedeihen /der du mit Got dem vatter in eynigkeyt des heyligen geysts/lebst vnd regirest ymmer vnd ewiglich/Amen.

*Also bald nach disem Gebet/sol er anfahen die verba Consecrationis zu singen/oder mit lauter wolvernemlicher stimme zu sprechen/wie er andre gesang vormals gesungen oder gesprochen hat/wie hernach folget. Vnd sol sich fleissen/das seine geberd/mit den worten sich vergleichen: das ist wann er singt/*Nam er das Brot/*so sol er auch*

die grossen Hostien nemen/vnd seiner brust gleich halten/ bisz die wort volendet sein. Deszgleichen wenn er singt Nam er den Kelch/*sol er mit dem Kelch auch also thun/ wie vorgemelt ist.*

(Fol. 26 v.)

Unser Herr Iesus in der nacht da er verrathen ward /nam er das brot/dancket/vnd brachs/vnd gabs sein Jungern/und sprach: Nembt hin und esset. Das ist mein leib/der für euch gegeben wirt/das thut zu meinem gedechtnis.

Hie sol er die grossen Hostia mit geneygtem haupt auffheben/vnd dem volck zaigen.

Darnach auch den Kelch nemen/vnd halten/bisz er die volgenden wort singt/oder spricht.

(Fol. 27 r.)

Desselben gleichen nam er auch den Kelch/nach dem Abendmal/vnd dancket/vnd gab in den/vnd sprach: Trinckt alle daraus. Das ist mein blut des newen Testaments/das fur euch vnd fur vil vergossen wird/zu vergebung der sünden. Solchs thut/so offt jr trinckt/zu meinem gedechtnis.

Hie sol er den Kelch auch auffheben/vnd den volck zaigen.

Antididagma, seu Christianae et Catholicae religionis per Rever. et Illust. Dominos Canonicos Metropolitanae Ecclesiae Coloniensis propugnatio, adversus librum quendam universis Ordinibus seu Statibus Dioecesis eiusdem nuper bonae titulo Reformationis exhibitum, ac postea, mutatis quibusdam, Consultoriae deliberationis nomine impressum.

Sententia item Delectorum per venerabile capitulum Ecclesiae Coloniensis, de vocatione Martini Buceri.

Parisiis

Apud Iacobum Kerver via ad divum Iacobum sub insigni duorum gallorum. 1545.

(The original sent to their Archbishop Herman by the chapter, Saturday, February 3, 1543.)

(Fol. 103 v.) *De Consecratione Eucharistiae, et tertio Missae Sacrificio.*

Completo sacrificio laudis quod pro statu totius mundi offertur, sequitur praecipuum missae caput, quod est consecratio divinissimi sacramenti. . . . In hac consecratione sacerdos Ecclesiae nomine per invocationem Dei, quae eius promissione, et mandato filii sui, tota innititur, suppliciter orat, ut Deus propositam illam panis et vini mixti oblationem, quae iam in signum totalis nostrae deditionis et gratiarum actionis oblata est consequenter in omnibus benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere dignetur, ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat domini nostri Iesu Christi. Ac mox pronunciat sacerdos Evangelistarum verba: QUI PRIDIE quam pateretur et caetera. Quibus statim divina Christi verba subjungit, quorum virtute dignissimum et sacratissimum illud corporis et sanguinis sacramentum consecratur et efficitur: HOC EST CORPUS MEUM una cum aliis divinis verbis, quae super calicem proferuntur. . . .

(Fol. 117 v.) *An sine Prece Canonica Ecclesiae consecratur Sacramentum.*

Hic postulat necessitas ut indicemus vehementem prorsus insaniam esse, quod nunc quidam arbitrantur se consecrare Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi, sine catholica prece quem canonem appellamus, et absque invocatione nominis divini, super dona proposita, sed tantum recitatione seu lectione verborum Pauli. 1. Cor. 11. Dominus Iesus in qua nocte tradebatur, etc. Quum Apostolus illic solum historice (fol. 118 r.) narret facta, quae Christus gessit: non autem ut formam aliquam consecrandi tradat, qua sacerdos Ecclesiae minister, cum invocatione nominis divini proposita dona benedicat et

sanctificet, non utique suis, sed omnipotentibus domini nostri Iesu Christi verbis.

* * * * * * *

Nec est difficile istud in re simili, aliorum Sacramentorum formis evincere. Christus docuit Apostolos baptizare, dicens: Ite et baptizate omnes gentes, In nomine patris, et filii, et spiritus sancti. Quis autem tam obtuso est sensu, ut ausit dicere, sacerdotem, qui recitat aut legat verba Evangelii de instituto baptismo, non autem pronuntiet essentialis baptizandi formae verba: Ego te baptizo, in nomine patris, et filii, et spiritus sancti, puerum vere et rite baptizare? praesertim cum sacerdos id faciens non obeat Ecclesiae ministerium, nec quicquam ad puerum dicat, sed verba tantum legat historiae. Nec fungatur legatione pro Christo, tanquam Deo per ipsum baptizante, sed rem gestam recitat tantum. (fol. 118 v.) Ita plane et hic necesse est arbitrari, si quis recitet, aut relegat tantum historiam institutionis huius sacramenti, quomodo illa in Paulo conscripta est, non invocet autem tanquam Ecclesiae minister, nomen Dei super dona proposita panis et vini, nec item consecrationis verba dirigat ad hostiam presentem, hunc talem nequaquam consecrare, nec verum sacramentum secundum Ecclesiae catholicae sensum et traditionem efficere. Aliter profecto censuerunt et fecerunt sancti patres Orientalis et Occidentalis Ecclesiae. Imo et Apostoli: invocarunt enim super hostiam, velut Ecclesiae ministri nomen Dei, eamque solenni prece consecrarunt. . . .

(Fol. 119 v.)

Unum tantum antiquissimi Irenaei verbum libuit dictis adiicere. Is enim libro quarto, capite tricesimoquarto, dicit panem, qui percipiat invocationem Dei, fieri Eucharistiam, etc. Iam vero qui canonem non habent, nec Deum invocant, nec verba ad dona proposita dirigunt, ac pro inde non consecrant, sed legunt tantum historica Apostoli Pauli verba, quibus narrat institutionem Christi,

non autem quomodo Paulus ipse verba super panem et vinum solitus sit pronunciare, quando corpus consecravit et sanguinem Domini, quomodo dici queat istos consecrare?

The Book of Common Prayer of the Reformed Episcopal Church. Adopted, and set forth for use, by the second General Council of the said Church held in the city of New York, in the month of May, 1874

Philadelphia: James A. Moore, 1220 & 1222 Sansom St. [1874].

All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and didst [!] institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death and sacrifice, until his coming again; for in the night in which he was betrayed he took Bread; and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper, he took the Cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all [of] this; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. (Pp. 93–94.)

N.B. There is no rubric preceding, no title given to this ascription of praise, and no "Amen" at the close. There are also no "manual acts" ordered in the course thereof.

The Rev. Edward Stephens's LITURGY ACCORDING TO THE USAGE OF THE MOST ANCIENT CHRISTIANS, c. 1700

Blessed be thou, Almighty, most glorious, and most gracious God, our Heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thy only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption: who made there, by his own oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue and celebrate, a perpetual memorial of that his precious death and sacrifice, until his coming again: and for that purpose, in the same night wherein he was betrayed, took *bread* into his holy and immaculate hands, and looking up to heaven, to thee, his God and Father, gave thanks, blessed and sanctified it; and *brake* it, and *gave* it to his disciples, saying, This is the mystery of the New Testament; take, eat, *this is my body* which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper he took the *chalice* of wine, mixed with water, and looking up to heaven, to thee his God and Father, gave thanks, blessed and sanctified it; and *gave* it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for *this is my blood* of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins: do this, as often as ye shall drink it, in commemoration of me.

Wherefore, O Lord, Holy Father, we thy humble servants, according to his holy institution, with these thy holy gifts, *commemorating* that his bitter but most precious death and passion, and solemnly *representing* the same before thy Divine Majesty, as the great, most holy, and only propitiation for all our sins, and the sins of the whole world; and being mindful also of his powerful resurrection, glorious ascension into heaven, and blessed session at thy right hand to intercede for us till he shall come again

with great power and glory to judge both the living and the dead, and to distribute to every one according to their works done in the flesh; do *offer* unto thee, by him, this *pure and immaculate offering*, with our most humble adoration, highest praises, and most hearty *thanks*, for thy inestimable clemency, goodness, and benignity to us, therein and thereby demonstrated to men and angels: and most humbly and earnestly *supplicate* and beseech thee, that this our unbloody, reasonable, and spiritual sacrifice may be acceptable and well-pleasing unto thee, most mighty God, by our anointed Jesus, who gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to thee, for a sweet-smelling savour: that thou will be pleased graciously to behold the same, and look upon this token and memorial of the Covenant, from thy glorious throne in heaven, and be propitious to us, and to thy whole Catholic Church, in the free and full *pardon* of all our sins, in a liberal and bountiful collation of thy rich treasure of the inestimable *graces* of thy Holy Spirit upon us, and in a gracious *audience* of the prayers, and acceptance of the thanksgivings, which we here offer unto thee. And send down thy Holy Spirit upon these proposited elements, to sanctify and bless them; that to us who partake thereof, this *bread* may be made the precious body of thy Christ, and this *wine* the precious blood of thy Christ, to the remission of all our sins, and to the mighty confirmation of us in all grace and virtue, and to eternal life.

HALL'S Fragmenta Liturgica, Vol. II., pp. 79–82.

The Nonjurors' Liturgy of 1718

Holiness is thy Nature and thy Gift, O Eternal King; Holy is thine only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom Thou hast made the Worlds; Holy is thine Ever-blessed Spirit, who searcheth all things, even the depths of thine infinite Perfection. Holy art Thou, Almighty and Merciful God; Thou createdst Man in thine

own Image, broughtest him into Paradise, and didst place him in a state of Dignity and Pleasure: And when he had lost his Happiness by transgressing thy Command, Thou of thy Goodness didst not abandon and despise him. Thy Providence was still continued, thy Law was given to revive the Sense of his Duty, thy Prophets were commissioned to reclaim and instruct him. And when the Fulness of time was come, Thou didst send thine only begotten Son to satisfy thy Justice, to strengthen our Nature, and renew thine Image within us: For these glorious Ends thine Eternal Word came down from Heaven, was incarnate by the Holy Ghost, born of the Blessed Virgin, conversed with Mankind, and directed his Life and Miracles to our Salvation: And when his Hour was come to offer the Propitiatory Sacrifice upon the Cross; when he, who had no Sin himself, mercifully undertook to suffer Death for our Sins, in the same Night that he was betrayed he (*a*) took Bread; and when he had given thanks, (*b*) he brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, Take, eat, (*c*) THIS IS MY BO✠DY, which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of me.

(a) *Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his Hands:*

(b) *And here to break the Bread:*

(c) *And here to lay his Hand upon all the Bread.*

Here the People shall answer,

Amen.

Then shall the Priest say,

Likewise after Supper (*d*) he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for (*e*) THIS IS MY BLO✠OD of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the Remission of Sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall

(d) *Here he is to take the Cup into his Hands:*

(e) *And here to lay his Hand upon every Vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine and*

drink it, in remembrance of me. *Water to be consecrated.*

Here the People shall answer,

Amen.

Then shall the Priest say,

Wherefore, having in remembrance his Passion, Death, and Resurrection from the Dead; his Ascension into Heaven, and second coming with Glory and great Power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every Man according to his Works; we offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to his holy Institution, this Bread and this Cup; giving thanks to Thee through him, that Thou hast vouchsafed us the Honour to stand before Thee, and to Sacrifice unto Thee. And we beseech Thee to look favourably on these thy Gifts, which are here set before Thee, O Thou Self-sufficient God: And do Thou accept them to the Honour of thy Christ; and send down thine Holy Spirit, the Witness of the Passion of our Lord Jesus, upon this Sacrifice, that he may make this (*f*) Bread the Body of thy Christ, and this (*g*) Cup the Blood of thy Christ; that they who are partakers thereof, may be confirmed in Godliness, may obtain Remission of their Sins, may be delivered from the Devil and his Snares, may be replenished with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of thy Christ, and may obtain everlasting Life, Thou, O Lord Almighty, being reconciled unto them, through the Merits and Mediation of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; who, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever one God, World without end. *Amen.*

(f) *Here the Priest shall lay his hand upon the Bread.*

(g) *And here upon every Vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine and Water.*

Brett's A Collection of the Principal Liturgies, etc., London, 1720, pp. 141–143.

Bishop Deacon's HOLY LITURGY, 1734

Wherefore having in remembrance those things which he endured for our sakes, we give thanks to thee, O God Almighty, not as we ought, but as we are able, and fulfil his institution. For in the same night that he was betrayed, he *Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands* took bread into his holy and immaculate hands; and looking up to thee his God and Father, and *And here to break the bread with both his hands, having first set the Paten down on the Altar* breaking it, he gave it to his disciples, saying: This is the mystery of the New Testament; take of it; eat; *And here to lay his hands upon all the bread* This is my Body which is broken for many for the remission of sins. In like manner also having mixed *Here he is to take the cup into his hands* the cup with wine and water, and blessed it, he gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of it; *And here, the cup being first set down on the altar, he is to lay his hands upon it, and upon every vessel, in which there is any wine mixed with water to be consecrated* This is my Blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; Do this for a Memorial of me: For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth my death till I come.

Therefore in commemoration of his passion, death, and resurrection from the dead, his ascension into heaven, and second coming with glory and great power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works, *Here the Priest is to lift up his hands and eyes to heaven*, we Offer to thee our King and our God, according to his institution, *And here to point with his right hand to all the bread* this Bread and *And here to point with his left hand to the cup and every vessel on the Altar, in which there is any wine and water* this Cup; giving thanks to thee through him, that thou hast vouchsafed us the honour to stand before thee, and to sacrifice unto thee. And we

beseech thee to look favourably on these Gifts, which are here set before thee, O thou self-sufficient God: And do thou Accept them to the honour of thy Christ; and send down thine Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, upon this sacrifice, that he may make *Here the Priest is to lay his hands upon all the bread* this Bread the Bo✝dy *And here to make the sign of the cross over all the bread* of thy Christ, and *And here to lay his hands upon the cup and upon every vessel on the Altar, in which there is any wine and water* this Cup the Blo✝od *And here to make the sign of the cross over the cup and over every vessel on the Altar, in which there is any wine and water* of thy Christ; that they who shall partake thereof, may be confirmed in godliness, may receive remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his snares, may be replenished with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of thy Christ, and may obtain everlasting life, Thou being reconciled unto them, O Lord Almighty.

Original Edition, London, 1734, pp. 91–93.

Bishop Rattray's OFFICE FOR THE SACRIFICE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, 1744

Holy art thou, O eternal King, and the Giver of all Holiness: Holy is thine only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom thou madest the Worlds: Holy also is thy holy Spirit, who searcheth all Things, even the Depths of Thee, O God. Holy art Thou, who rulest over all, almighty and good God, terrible, yet full of Compassion: But especially indulgent to the Workmanship of thy own Hands; for thou didst make Man, formed out of the Earth, after thy own Image, and graciously gavest him the Enjoyment of Paradise: and when he had lost his Happiness by transgressing thy Commandment, thou didst not despise nor abandon him; but didst discipline him as a merciful Father, and train him up by the Pedagogy of the Law and the prophets: And last of all thou

didst send thine own only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, into the World, that by his Coming he might renew thy Image in us: who descended from Heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin *Mary*, conversed with Mankind, and directed his whole dispensation to our Salvation. And when the Hour was come, that he who had no Sin, was to suffer a voluntary and life-giving Death upon the Cross for us Sinners, in the same Night that he was betrayed, or rather offered up himself for the Life and Salvation of the World, taking (*a*) Bread into his holy and immaculate Hands, looking up to Heaven and presenting it to Thee his God and Father, he gave Thanks, sanctified, and (*b*) brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, Take, eat, (*c*) THIS IS MY BO✠DY which is broken and given for you: For the Remission of Sins.

In like manner after Supper he took the (*d*) Cup, and having mixed it of Wine and Water he gave Thanks, sanctified, and blessed it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, Drink ye all of this, THIS (*e*) IS MY BLO✠OD of the New Testament, which is shed and given for you and for many, for the Remission of Sins. Do this in Remembrance of me.

(a) *Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his Hands.*

(b) *And here to break the Bread.*

(c) *And here to lay his Hands upon all the Bread.*

(d) *Here he is to take the Chalice into his Hands.*

(e) *And here to lay his Hands upon every Vessel in which there is any Wine to be consecrated.*

Wherefore in Commemoration of his life-giving Passion, salutary Cross, Death, Burial, and Resurrection from the Dead on the third Day, his Ascension into Heaven, and Sitting at the right Hand of Thee his God and Father, and looking for his second and terrible Advent, when he shall come again with Glory to judge the Quick and the Dead, and shall render to every one according to his Works, we Sinners offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and

unbloody Sacrifice: Beseeching Thee, that thou wouldst not deal with us after our Sins, nor reward us after our Iniquities; but according to thy Clemency and ineffable Love to Mankind overlooking and blotting out the Hand-writing that is against us thy Servants, wouldst grant us thy heavenly and eternal good Things; for thy People and thine Inheritance make their Supplications unto Thee: Have Mercy upon us, O Lord God, Almighty Father, have Mercy upon us according to thy great Mercy, and send down thy holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts which are here set before Thee, that by his Descent upon them, he may make this (*a*) Bread the holy BO✠DY of thy Christ, and this (*b*) Cup the precious BLO✠OD of thy Christ; that they may be to all who partake of them, for the Sanctification of Soul and Body, for bringing forth the Fruit of good Works, for Remission of Sins, and for Life everlasting.

(a) *Here the Priest shall lay his Hands upon all the Bread.*

(b) *And here upon the Chalice, and every Vessel in which there is any wine.*

Original Edition, London, 1744, pp. 116–117.

Extract from a Letter in the Possession of the Rev. W. F. Brand, D.D.

8 Chelsea Square, N.Y.
Jany. 17, 1899.

My dear Dr. Brand:

My attention having been called to your letter in the *Churchman* of Jany. 7, I read it with great interest and satisfaction: and, although I am at present rather particularly engaged, I feel that I should be deficient in my duty, if I did not, "all business and excuses being laid aside," at once render to you my hearty thanks for the trouble which you have taken in this matter, and for the clear, courageous, and convincing manner in which you have expressed yourself.

I regret, however, that you conceded so much as to accept as true the attributing of *extreme views* to Bishop Seabury. With all the decision and firmness of his character, which made him uncompromising in principle, and very direct and positive in statement, there is nothing, I think, more remarkable in him than his moderation: nor, perhaps, does anything furnish better evidence of this, in general, than the manifest tendency of certain brethren to consider his churchmanship as deficient, as indeed it is — in the same sense in which the Primitive Church was deficient in the churchmanship developed in later times.

That his views even upon the question of the validity of Consecration without Invocation were extreme, is, I think, not apparent. To say that he hardly considered the English form as "strictly amounting to a consecration," and to yield to another the use of it in the Celebration, amounts to no more, especially under the circumstances of the matter being then under particular consideration, than a distinct disapproval of that form as compared with another. Had he declined to receive the elements thus consecrated, there might have been more room for the charge of extreme views. And even stronger expressions than this, such as I will refer to later, are to be understood argumentatively, to point the urgency of his appeal for a better and more perfect way, rather than taken absolutely condemnatory of a way by which he himself had been from his youth a partaker of the means of grace.

The implication that the Invocation is not to [be] regarded as essential to consecration in the American Church because that would be a departure in doctrine from the English Church, reminds me of what Bp. Seabury said in regard to the claim of the Methodists to a valid Episcopate — that it was "something very like impudence." If the Church, of England teaches as matter of doctrine that the bare recitation of the words of Institution suffices for Consecration, it is obvious from the Form provided, and

from the requirement of its repetition in case of consecration of additional elements, that the American Church has, in so far, departed. But the just inference from the declaration in the Preface coupled with the Form provided, is that, in the judgment of the American Church, the Church of England held at least implicitly the doctrine which the American form explicitly stated and more carefully guarded. And such, I think, has been the ground notably taken by defenders of the Church of England from the charge of deficiency in this particular: that the Church meant not to ignore the agency of the Holy Spirit, but implied the prayer for it in the words associated with the words of Institution. Nor would this ground be essentially weakened by the omission of such associated words in a second consecration of elements, since these words once used already might fairly be taken as applicable to the whole Celebration, of which the second consecration was merely an incident. That the American Church has provided for the use of the form in full in similar contingency, only shows the greater care with which it has guarded the principle involved: and, as evidence of doctrine, the positive requirement in the American Church is much more weighty than the omission in the English Church.

The point made by your English correspondent as to the position occupied by those who use the English form, and that of those who would use the American form if it ended with the words of Institution, is extremely well taken, and should serve as a caution.

It is obvious, and I suppose the charge would not be repudiated, that the motive of the criticism to which you justly take exception, is not only unwillingness to depart from the position of the Church of England, but also, and especially, anxiety to coincide with that of Rome. . . .

It is worthy of notice that this very tendency of the English form to lead men in the same direction as does the Roman form, was present to the mind of Bp. Seabury

in his advocacy of the fuller form which he urged. Not only was this point present to his mind, but it was most explicitly and emphatically pressed by him upon Bp. White, and through him upon the members of the Convention. The letter which Bp. Seabury wrote to Bp. White in June 1789 was written, as the author informs him, in expectation that it would be laid before the Convention, whose next session was in the ensuing August. It was this session which was adjourned for that in October, at which Bp. Seabury and representatives from Eastern States were present by invitation; and at which, the Constitution having been acceded to, the revision of the Book of Common Prayer was taken up and concluded.

The following extract from this letter bears closely upon this point. I take it from the copy in Beardsley's life of Bp. Seabury, and transcribe it in full lest the volume should at present happen not to be at hand.

"That . . . efficacy." [See above, pp. 228–229.]

Is it even possible that the two Houses of General Convention, in providing for the restoration here referred to, acted not only inadvertently, but in mere stupidity, with no intent to recognize, and in actual ignorance of, any difference between the form abandoned and that which was substituted for it[?] *Credat M . . . !* It is, to say the least, wholly improbable. Bp. White certainly had fair notice of the point of difference, even supposing, which I have too much respect for his theological intelligence to imagine, that he would not otherwise have seen it. Dr. Wm. Smith, the President of the lower House, whose reading of the proposed form is said to have produced so favourable an impression upon its members, was also in a position to understand the significance of the change; and if the House as a body was not educated up to the standard of modern knowledge of ancient and medieval ritual, it was not so obtuse as to fail to recognize a differ-

ence palpable to anyone who was without a motive to induce him to ignore it.

With much respect,
As ever truly yours,
(signed) Wm. J. Seabury.

The Revd.
W. F. Brand, D.D.

Notices and Journals, and Remains of Journals, of the two preliminary Conventions of the Clergy, and of the first five annual Conventions and two adjourned Conventions of the Clergy and Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Maryland. In the years 1783, 1784, 1785, 1786, 1787, 1788: . . .

From the papers of the Rev. Dr. West, Secretary of the Convention. (*Never before published.*)

[N.B. These form a special appendix (with separate pagination) to the "Journal of the Seventy-Second Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland; Held in S. Peter's Church, Baltimore, Wednesday, May 30; Thursday, May 31; and Friday, June 1, 1855. Baltimore: Printed by Joseph Robinson, No. 125 Baltimore St., 1855."]

An adjourned Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland.

Held in Annapolis, April, 1786.

Of this Convention there are no manuscript papers remaining, but reference is made to it in a succeeding Journal.

On the 17th and 18th pages of the Journal of the Convention in 1789, we find that a report was then made and agreed to, "that the article agreed to in a Convention of *April,* 1786, respecting the ratification of the Book of Common Prayer, &c., recommended by the General Convention held in 1785 at Philadelphia, and the amendments proposed to be made to the same by the Convention of this State, held in *April,* 1786, be adopted."

The article agreed to in Convention, *April*, 1786, is as follows: —

"The Convention then took into serious consideration the Book of Common Prayer, and the administration of the Sacraments, &c., as recommended by the General Convention at Philadelphia, for the future use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States; and although they could have wished that the book had been published time enough for every member to have had a deliberate consideration and perusal of it, before the meeting of this Convention, yet nevertheless, having examined and considered it, with all the attention and care that the time of their sitting would admit, they do approve and ratify the same, as far as their powers extend, and recommend it to the use of the several churches in this State as soon as the congregations can be supplied with a sufficient number of books — proposing to the General Convention that shall meet in Philadelphia in June next, that in the future editions of the Common Prayer Book, the following additions, alterations, or amendments be ordered, viz.:

. . . That in the consecration prayer in the Holy Sacrament, after the words 'until His coming again,' and before the words 'our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution,' be inserted the following paragraph, instead of that which now stands, viz: 'Hear us O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify these Thy creatures of bread and wine, that we receiving them according to Thy Son' . . ."

There were also delegates for the General Convention to be holden in June, 1786, appointed. Two of them, as is shown by the Journal of that Convention, were the Rev. Dr. William Smith, and the Rev. William Smith of Stepney, Somerset. Pp. 17, 18.

Journal of the Meetings, which led to the Institution of a Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania: together with the Journals of the First Six Conventions of the said Church.

Philadelphia.

Printed by Hall & Sellers — No. 51 — Market-street.

M.DCC.XC.

Saturday 27 May, 1786.

The Committee appointed to view and consider the Book of Common Prayer, made their report; and the same, being duly considered, was adopted, in the words following, viz.

"The convention having examined the Book of Common Prayer, as revised and proposed by the general convention of September and October last, instruct their deputies to the ensuing general convention to propose the following amendments.

". . . *Second.* That, in the consecration-prayer, in the office of the holy sacrament, after the words, 'until his coming again,' and before the words, 'according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution,' be inserted the following paragraph, instead of that now used: 'Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify these thy creatures of bread and wine, that we, receiving them.'" Pp. 15, 16.

BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

Address to the Members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, by a Layman, London, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, 1846.

Agobard of Lyons, *De Privilegio et Jure Sacerdotii,* P.L.[2] civ. *Liber contra Libros Quatuor Amalarii Abbatis,* P.L. civ.

Alcuin, *Disputatio Puerorum,* P.L. ci. *Liber Sacramentorum,* P.L. ci.

Alger of Liège, *De Sacramentis Corporis et Sanguinis Dominici,* P.L. clxxx.

**Alphabetum Sacerdotum,* Paris, 1499, in *Tracts on the Mass.*

Amalarius, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis,* P.L. cv. *Eclogae de Officio Missae,* P.L. cv.

Ambrose (S.), of Milan, *De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum,* P.L. xiv. *De Fide,* P.L. xvi. *De Mysteriis,* P.L. xvi. *De Spiritu Sancto,* P.L. xvi.

Anastasius Sinaita, *Oratio de Sacra Synaxi,* P.G.[3] lxxxix.

Andrewes, Bp. Launcelot, *Preces Privatae,* ed. Brightman, London, 1903. *Visitation Articles,* Minor Works, *A.C.L.*,[4] Oxford, 1854. *Sermons,* Vol. III., *A.C.L.,* Oxford, 1841.

Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople to the Papal Encyclical on Union [1896].

Antididagma, seu Christianae et Catholicae religionis per Rever. et Illust. Dominos Canonicos Metropolitanae Ecclesiae Coloniensis propugnatio, adversus librum . . . nuper bonae titulo Reformationis exhibitum, ac postea . . . Consultoriae deliberationis nomine impressum . . . Parisiis . . . 1545.

Atchley, E. G. Cuthbert F., **English Ceremonial,* in Vol. IIII., pp. 3–35, of The Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers, London, 1904. *Ordo Romanus Primus, with Introduction and Notes,* Vol. VI., same series, London, 1905.

Athanasius (S.), of Alexandria, *Sermo in Bapt.,* P.G. xxvi.

Atrebatensis, Acta Synodi, 1025 A.D., P.L. cxlii.

Augustine (S.), of Hippo, *De Trinitate,* P.L. xlii. *Epistola cxlix. ad Paulinum,* P.L. xxxiii. *Hom.* 227, *in die Paschae iv.,* P.L. xxxviii. *Sermones inediti,* P.L. xlvi.

[1] This list (with a few exceptions marked *) contains *only* those works quoted from, or referred to, in the foregoing pages.

[2] P.L. = Migne's *Patrologia Latina.*

[3] P.G. = Migne's *Patrologia Graeca.*

[4] *A.C.L.* = *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.*

*Badger, G. P., *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, two vols., London, 1852.
Basil (S.), of Cæsarea, *De Spiritu Sancto*, P.G. xxxii.
Beardsley, E. Edwards, *Life and Correspondence of the Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.*, Boston, 1881.
Becon, Thomas, *Works*, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843–1844.
Bede, The Venerable, *Homilies, Book I.*, P.L. xciv.
Berengar of Tours, *De Sacra Coena*, ed. A. F. and F. Th. Vischer, Berlin, 1834.
Bernardakis, D. N., ΙΕΡΑ ΚΑΤΗΧΗΣΙΣ (third edition), Constantinople, 1876.
Bernold of Constance, *Micrologus*, P.L. cli.
Bethune-Baker, J. F., *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*, etc., London, 1903.
*Biggs, C. R. Davey, edited by, *The Worship of the Orthodox Church*, Occasional Paper No. V., New Series, of the Eastern Church Association, Oxford, 1903.
Bingham, Joseph, *Origines Ecclesiasticae*, edition revised by Richard Bingham (eight volumes), London, 1834.
*Bishop, Edmund, *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, in Vol. IIII., of The Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers, pp. 281–307, London, 1904.
*Blackmore, R. W., *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, Aberdeen, 1845.
Book of Common Prayer, The, for Scotland, original edition, Edinburgh, 1637.
Book of Common Prayer, The, Sealed Book, first edition, London, 1662.
Book of Common Prayer, The, American (after the Standard), New York, 1892.
Book of Common Worship, The, set forth for voluntary use by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Philadelphia, 1905.
*Borovnitsky, Ivan, *The Origin and Composition of the Roman Catholic Liturgy*, etc. (translated from the Russian by Basil Popoff), London, 1863.
Box, G. H., *The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist*, in *The Journal of Theological Studies*,[1] Vol. III., pp. 357–369 (April, 1902).
Bramhall, Abp. John, *The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified*, *Works*, Vol. III., *A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1844.
Brett, Bp. Thomas, *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies . . . with a Dissertation upon Them*, London, 1720. (Reprinted, 1838.)
Brightman, F. E., *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., Eastern

[1] Usually indicated by *J. Th. S.*

Liturgies, Oxford, 1896. **The Eucharistic Sacrifice* [not published].

Bruno of Segni, *Commentaria in Matthaeum*, P.L. clxv. *Sententiarum, Liber IV.*, 9, P.L. clxv.

Burbidge, Edward, *Origin of the Roman Canon*, in *The Guardian*, March 24, 1897, p. 471.

Burckard, John, *Ordo Missae*, Rome, 1502, in *Tracts on the Mass.*

Cabasilas, Nicholas, Abp. of Thessalonica, *Exposition of the Divine Liturgy*, P.G. cl.

*Cabrol, F., *Les Origines Liturgiques*, Paris, 1906.

Cæsarius of Arles, *De Paschate*, P.L. lxvii.

Campbell, Bp. Archibald, *An Essay upon the Holy Eucharist* appended to *The Doctrine of a Middle State . . .*, London, 1721.

Caroline Books, The, P.L. xcviii.

Carthusians, Ancient Statutes of, in Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, Libri Tres, etc., Editio novissima (four volumes), Antwerp, 1763–1764.

*Cheffontaine, Christophe de, *Varii Tractatus et Disputationes de eo quod sit utile atque necessarium, nonnullas secum pugnantes scholasticorum scriptorum opiniones, . . . ad decretorum concilii Tridentini normam conciliare et corrigere.* Authore R. P. C. de capite fontium Archiep. Caesarien. nuper totius ordinis Minorum generali ministro. Ad Sixtum quintum Pontificem maximum. Parisiis, 1586.

Chosroae Magni Episcopi Monophysitici Explicatio Precum Missae, e lingua Armenica in Latinam versa per Dr. P. Vetter, Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1880.

Chrysostom (S.), John, *De Coemeterio et Cruce*, P.G. xlix. *De Sacerdotio*, P.G. xlviii. *Hom. i. and ii. De Proditione Judae*, P.G. xlix. *Hom. xlv. in Joannem*, P.G. lix. *Hom. in Pentecost.*, P.G. l. *Hom. ii. in 2 Tim.*, P.G. lxii.

Church Quarterly Review, The, Vol. XXIX., No. 58 (January, 1890), *Mr. Baring-Gould and the Holy Eucharist in the First Three Centuries*, pp. 355–385. Vol. XXXI., No. 62 (January, 1891), *Capitulum Coloniense: An Episode in the Reformation*, pp. 419–437. *Vol. XXXVIII., No. 76 (July, 1894), *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 347–358. *Vol. XLII., No. 83 (April, 1896), *Anglican Orders, Part II.*, pp. 24–51. Vol. LIV., No. 108 (July, 1902), *The Early Years of the Reign of Elizabeth*, pp. 339–356. Vol. LXIII., No. 126 (January, 1907), *The Mozarabic Rite. II. The Mozarabic Mass*, pp. 298–322.

Church Times, The, Review of Dr. Gee's "The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments," May 9, 1902, p. 579.

Ciconiolanus, Ludovicus, *Directorium Divinorum Officiorum*, Rome, 1539, in *Tracts on the Mass.*

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata, I.*, xix., P.G. viii.
Clermont, Synodical Statutes of, 1268 A.D., Mansi,[1] XXIII.
Collier, Bp. Jeremy, *A Vindication of the Reasons and Defence*, etc., Part II., London, 1719.
Cologne, Synod of, 1280 A.D., Mansi, XXIV.
*Comper, J., *The Catholic Theory of the Consecration of the Holy Eucharist*, Edinburgh, n. d.
Constantinople, Council of, 754 A.D., Mansi, XIII.
Cooper, J., *The Book of Common Prayer . . . commonly known as Laud's Liturgy* (1637), with Historical Introduction and Illustrative Notes, Edinburgh and London, 1904.
Cooper, J., and A. J. Maclean, *The Testament of Our Lord*, translated into English from the Syriac, with Introduction and Notes, Edinburgh, 1902.
Cosin, Bp. John, *Historia Transubstantiationis Papalis*, Works, *A.C.L.*, Vol. IV., Oxford, 1851. *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*, second series, *A.C.L.*, Vol. V., Oxford, 1855.
Covel, John, *Some Account of the Present Greek Church*, etc., Cambridge, 1722.
Crakanthorp, Richard, *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae, A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1847.
*Currie, Hugh P., *Notes on the Scottish Liturgy*, etc., Edinburgh and Oxford, 1902.
Cyprian, *De Oratione Dominica*, P.L. iv. *De Unitate Ecclesiae Catholicae*, P.L. iv. *Epistle to Epictetus*, P.L. iv.
Cyril (S.) of Alexandria, *Epistle (Oecumen.) ii. to Nestorius*, P.G. lxxvii. *In Joannem*, P.G. lxxiii. *In Lucam*, P.G. lxxii. *In Matthaeum*, P.G. lxxii.
Cyril (S.) of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*, P.G. xxxiii.
*Dabovich, S., *The Holy Orthodox Church*, etc., Wilkes Barre, 1898.
Damascene, John, *De Fide Orthodoxa*, P.G. xciv. *Hom. de Sabbato Sancto*, P.G. xcvi.
Deacon, Bp. Thomas, *A Compleat Collection of Devotions*, etc., London, 1734. *A Full, True, and Comprehensive View of Christianity, etc., . . . The Whole succinctly and fully laid down in Two Catechisms*, London, 1747.
Delisle, L., *Mémoire sur d'Anciens Sacramentaires*, in t. XXXII. part. I., *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belle-Lettres*, Paris, 1886.
De Vert, Claude, *Explication . . . des Cérémonies de l'Eglise* (four volumes), Paris, 1720, 1710, 1713, 1713.
De Vignay, Jean, *Exposition de la Messe*, from *La Légende Dorée*, ed. W. H. Frere, Alcuin Club Collections, II., London, 1899.

[1] *Amplissima Collectio Conciliorum*, H. Welter's facsimile edition, 41 vols., Paris and Leipzig, 1901–1905.

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie, Vol. I., Paris, 1907, articles, AMEN, cols. 1554–1573; ANAMNÈSE, cols. 1880–1896; ANAPHORE, cols. 1898–1918, all by Dom F. Cabrol.

Dionysius of Alexandria (in Eusebius), P.G. xx., 656.

Dionysius bar Salibi, *Expositio Liturgiae* (abstract of), in Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, ii., Rome, 1721. **Expositio Liturgiae*, ed. H. Labourt, in *Scriptores Syri*, series secunda, tomus xciii., Paris, 1903.

Dowden, Bp. John, *The Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, etc., Edinburgh, 1884. *The Workmanship of the Prayer Book in its Literary and Liturgical Aspects*, London, 1899. *Catalogue of the Correspondence between the Nonjuring Bishops and the Eastern Churches* (1716–1725), in *J. Th. S.*, Vol. I., pp. 562–568 (July, 1900).

Duchesne, L., *Origines du Culte Chrétien* (second edition), Paris, 1898. *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution* (English translation from third French edition), London, 1903.

Durandus of Mende, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, Naples, 1859.

Durandus of Troarn, *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Christi*, P.L. cxlix.

Ebner, A., *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte . . . des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter.* Iter Italicum. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1896.

Ephraem Syrus, *De Sacerdotio; De Sanctis et Vivif. Christ. Sacramentis; Explanatio in Ezek., Opera Omnia*, ed. Petrus Benedictus, six volumes, Rome, 1732–1746.

*Etheridge, J. W., *The Syrian Churches*, etc., London, 1846.

Eusebius of Alexandria, in John Damascene, *Sacr. Paral.* II., xxix., P.G. xcvi.

Eusebius Bruno, *Epistola ad Berengarium Magistrum*, P.L. cxlvii.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, *De Laudibus Constantini*, P.L. xx.

Eustratius Argentes, *Treatise against Azymes, divided into Three Parts, of which . . . the Second is concerning the Consecration of the Mystery*, etc., Nauplia, 1845. (See above, p. 108, n. 1.)

Euthymius Zigadenus, *Panoplia Dogmatica*, P.G. cxxx.

Eutychius of Constantinople, *De Pasch. et de SS. Euch.*, P.G. lxxxvi.

Exeter, Synod of, 1287 A.D., Mansi, XXIV.

Εὐχολόγιον τὸ μέγα, Venice, 1891.

*Fairbairn, R. B., *The Oblation and the Invocation*, etc., New York, 1894.

Férotin, M., *Le Liber Ordinum . . .* publié pour la première fois avec une introduction . . . etc., Paris, 1904.

*Ffoulkes, E. S., *Primitive Consecration of the Eucharistic Oblation*, etc., London, 1885.
Firmilian of Cæsarea, *Epistola ad Cyprianum*, P.L. iii.
Florence, Council of, 1439 A.D., Proceedings of, etc., Mansi, XXXI A and XXXI B.
Florus, *De Expositione Missae*, P.L. cxix. *Opuscula adv. Amalarium*, P.L. cxix.
Forbes, Bp. Robert, *A Catechism dealing chiefly with the Holy Eucharist*, edited from the original MSS. for the Scottish Clergy Society, by John Dowden, D.D., Edinburgh, 1904.
Forbes, Bp. William, *Considerationes Modestae*, two vols., *A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1850, 1856.
Frankland, W. B., *The Early Eucharist* (A.D. 30–180), London, 1902.
Frere, W. H., **Edwardine Vernacular Services before the First Prayer Book*, in *J. Th. S.*, Vol. I., pp. 229–246 (January, 1900). *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of Its Offices, on the Basis of the former Work of Francis Procter, M.A.*, revised and rewritten, London, 1901. *The Use of Sarum*, two vols., Cambridge, 1898, 1901.
[Froude, R. H.,] *The Antiquity of the Existing Liturgies*, Tract No. 63, *Tracts for the Times*, by Members of the University of Oxford, Vol. II., for 1834–1835, London, Rivington; Oxford, Parker, 1836.
Fulgentius, of Ruspe, *Ad Monimum*, P.L. lxv. *Fragmenta adv. Fabianum*, P.L. lxv.
*Funk, F. X., *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, two vols., Paderborn, 1905.
Gabriel of Philadelphia, *Apologia pro Ecclesia Orientali*, in *Fides Ecclesiae Orientalis, seu Gabrielis Metropolitae Philadelphiensis Opuscula* . . . opera et studio Richardi Simonis . . ., Parisiis, 1671.
Gasquet, F. A., and E. Bishop, *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer* . . ., second edition, London, 1891.
Gaudentius of Brescia, *Sermo ii.*, P.L. xx.
Gee, Henry, *The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments*, London, 1902.
Gelasius I., Pope, *Epistle to Elpidius*, Mansi, VIII.
Gerbert, Martinus, *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicae* (two vols.), Typis San-Blasianis, 1777, 1779.
Germanus of Constantinople, *Rerum Eccl. Contemplatio*, P.G. xcviii.
*Gibson, Edmund, *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, second edition, two vols., Oxford, 1761.
[Gillespie,] *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies obtruded upon the Church of Scotland*, 1660.

Gore, Bp. Charles, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, New York, 1895. *The Body of Christ*, New York, 1901. *The Church and the Ministry*, fourth edition, London, 1900.

Grabe, J. E., *De Forma Consecrationis Eucharistiae*, etc., *A Defence of the Greek Church against the Roman, in the Article of the Consecration of the Eucharistical Elements*, London, 1721.

Gregory the Great, Pope, *Epistle to John of Syracuse*, P.L. lxxvii. *Dialogues*, P.L. lxxvii.

Gregory of Nyssa, *De Bapt. Christi*, P.G. xlvi. *Epist. can. ad Letoium epis. Melit.*, P.G. xlv. *In laudem fratris Basilii*, P.G. xlvi. *Oratio Catechetica*, P.G. xlv.

Guitmund of Aversa, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, P.L. cxlix.

Hammond, C. E., *The Ancient Liturgy of Antioch and other Liturgical Fragments*, etc., Oxford, 1879. **Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1878.

**Harmony, A, of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East*, etc., Aberdeen, 1846.

Hart, Samuel, *Bishop Seabury's Communion Office*, reprinted in facsimile, with an Historical Sketch and Notes, second edition, revised, New York, 1883.

Harvey, W. W., edited by, *Irenaeus adv. Haereses*, etc., two vols., Cambridge, 1857.

*Hassia, Henricus de, *Secreta Sacerdotum*, etc., Nuremberg, 1507.

Headlam, A. C., *The Teaching of the Russian Church*, etc. (Eastern Church Association), London, 1897.

Henke, C., *Die katholische Lehre über die Consecrationsworte*, etc., Trier, 1850.

Hickes, Bp. George, *Treatises*, three vols., *A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1847–1848.

Hildebert of Tours, *De Mysterio Missae*, P.L. clxxi.

Honorius of Autun, *Gemma Animae*, P.L. clxxii.

Honorius III., Pope, *Ad Praelatos Hiberniae*, Mansi, XXII.

Hooker, Richard, *Works*, two vols., Oxford, 1850.

Hoppe, L. A., *Die Epiklesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgieen und der römische Consekrationskanon*, Schaffhausen, 1864.

*Horner, G., *The Statutes of the Apostles*, etc., London 1904.

Hort, F. J. A., Εὐχαριστία — εὐχαριστεῖν, in *J. Th. S.*, Vol. III., pp. 594–598 (July, 1902).

*Howard, G. B., *The Christians of St. Thomas and Their Liturgies*, etc., Oxford and London, 1864.

Hubert, F., *Die Strassburger liturgischen Ordnungen im Zeitalter der Reformation*, etc., Göttingen, 1900.

Hugo of S.Victor (?), *Speculum de Mysteriis Ecclesiae*, P.L. clxxvii. *Indutus Planeta*, Lyons, 1507, in *Tracts on the Mass.*

Introduction, An, containing Observations on the Services for Morning and Evening, Sundays and Holydays, prefixed to an edition of the (American) Book of Common Prayer published by Plowman and Tanner, at Philadelphia, in 1805.

Irenæus (S.), *Adv. Haereses*, P.G. vii. (?) *Fragment* xxxvi., Harvey, ii., 500.

Isidore of Pelusium, *Epistolae*, P.G. lxxviii.

Isidore (S.), of Seville, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, P.L. lxxxiii. (?) *Epistle* (VII.) *to Redemptus*, P.L. lxxxiii. *Originum*, P.L. lxxxii.

Jacobs, H. E., *The Lutheran Movement in England*, etc., revised edition, Philadelphia, 1894.

Jerome, *Ad Evangelum*, P.L. xxii. *Commentary on Zephaniah*, P.L. xxv.

Johnson, John, *Works*, two vols., *A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1847.

Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, P.G. vi.

*Keeling, William, *Liturgiae Britannicae*, Second edition, London, 1851.

Kidd, B. J., *The Later Mediaeval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, London, 1898.

Lambert, J. C., *The Passover and the Lord's Supper*, in *J. Th. S.*, Vol. IV., pp. 184–193 (January, 1903).

Lathbury, T., *A History of the Nonjurors*, etc., London, 1845.

Laud, Abp. William, *Works*, seven vols., *A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1847–1860.

Le Brun, P., *Explication . . . de la Messe*, etc., four vols., Paris, 1726. *Défense de l'ancien Sentiment sur la Forme de la Consécration de l'Eucharistie*, etc., Paris, 1727.

Legg, J. Wickham, *Tracts on the Mass* (Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. XXVII.), London, 1904. **Mediaeval Ceremonial*, pp. 27–46 in his *Ecclesiological Essays* (Vol. VII. of The Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers), London, 1905.

Leishman, T., *The Westminster Directory*, edited with an Introduction and Notes, Edinburgh and London, 1901.

L'Estrange, Hamon, *The Alliance of Divine Offices*, etc., *A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1846.

Mabillon, J., *Museum Italicum*, etc. (two vols.), Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1724.

*Macarius, *Handbuch zum Studium der christlichen, orthodox-dogmatischen Theologie*, ins Deutsche übersetzt von Dr. Blumenthal, Moskau, 1875. *Théologie dogmatique orthodoxe*, traduite par un Russe (two vols.), Paris, 1860.

Maclean, Bp. A. J., *Recent Discoveries illustrating Early Christian Life and Worship*, London, 1904.

Magistretti, M., *Beroldus sive Ecclesiae Ambrosianae Mediolanensis Kalendarium et Ordines Saec.* XII. *ex Codice Ambrosiano* . . . Mediolani, 1894.

Malzew, A., *Die göttlichen Liturgieen unserer heiligen Väter Johannes Chrysostomos, Basilios des Grossen und Gregorios Dialogos.* Deutsch und slawisch . . . Berlin, 1890. *Die Sacramente der Orthodox-Katholischen Kirche des morgenlandes.* Deutsch und slawisch . . . Berlin, 1898. **Die Liturgien*, etc., Berlin, 1894. **Liturgikon*, Berlin, 1902.

Manuel (Great Rhetor), *Answer of*, P.G. cxl.

Mark of Ephesus, *That the divine gifts are not consecrated by the utterance of the Lord's words merely*, etc., P.G. clx.

*Maude, J. H., *The History of the Book of Common Prayer*, New York, 1899.

Mayence, Provincial Council of, 1261 A.D., Mansi, XXIII.

*McGarvey, William, *Liturgiae Americanae*, Philadelphia, 1895.

*Milne, J. R., *Considerations on Eucharistic Worship, or True and False Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, London, 1893. *The Doctrine and Practice of the Eucharist as deduced from Scripture and the Ancient Liturgies*, London, 1895.

*Mirkovitch, Gregory, О Времени Пресуществленія Святыхъ Даровъ, Вилна, 1886.

**Missale ad usum insignis et praeclarae Ecclesiae Sarum*, labore et studio F. H. Dickinson, Burntisland, 1861–1883.

Missale juxta ritum Ecclesie Romane . . . Parisiis, Ex officina libraria Iolande Bonhomme, vidue Thielmanni Kerver . . . 1555.

Missale Romanum (ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum). Antverpiae excudebat Christophorus Plantinus . . . 1573.

Missale Mixtum . . . Praefatione, Notis et Appendicibus ab Alexandro Lesleo, S. J., sacerdote, ornatum . . . P.L., lxxxv.

Mone, F. J., *Lateinische und griechische Messen aus dem zweiten bis sechsten Jahrhundert.* Frankfurt am Main, 1850.

Morton, Bp. Thomas, *Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Bodie and Blood of Christ (by some called) the Masse of Christ*, London, 1631.

Moschus, John, *Pratum Spirituale*, P.G. lxxxvii.

Mouravieff, A. N., *A History of the Church of Russia* (translated from the Russian by R. W. Blackmore), Oxford, 1842.

Munster, Council of, 1279 A.D., Mansi, XXIV.

Neale, J. M., *An Earnest Plea for the Retention of the Scotch Liturgy: A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Brechin*, London, 1862. *A History of the Holy Eastern Church*, Part I., General Introduction, London, 1850. *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History* . . . second edition, with Preface by the Rev. R. F. Littledale, LL.D., London, 1867.

Nestle, E., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, editio sexta, Stuttgart, 1906.

Nicæa, Council of, 787 A.D., Mansi, XIII.

Nicholas I., Pope, *Letter to Michael the Emperor*, P.L. cxix.
*Nicholas Bulgaris, *The Holy Catechism*, translated by W. E. Daniel, and edited by R. R. Bromage, London, 1893.
Nilus, *Epist. ad Phil. Schol.*, P.G. lxxix.
Norwich, Synodical Statutes of, 1257 A.D., Mansi, XXIII.
Odo of Cambray, *Expositio in Canonem Missae*, P.L. clx.
Odo of Paris, Synodical Constitutions of, 1197 A.D., Mansi, XXII.
Optatus of Milevis, *De Schism. Don.*, P.L. xi.
Origen, *Contra Celsum*, P.G. xi. *In S. Matth. xv.* 11, P.G. xiii.
Oxford, Council of, 1222 A.D., Mansi, XXII.
Overton, J. H., *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles and Writings*, London, 1902.
Palćographie Musicale, Vol. V., *Avant-propos*, pp. 55–96, Solesmes, 1896.
Parker, James, *An Introduction to the History of the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*. Oxford and London, 1877. **The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. compared with the successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*, Oxford and London, 1877.
Paschasius Radbertus, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, P.L. cxx.
Paul Winifred, *Life of Gregory the Great*, P.L. lxxv.
Perry, Bp. W. S., edited by, *Journals of General Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the United States*, 1785–1835. Vol. I., 1785–1821, Vol. II., 1823–1835, Vol. III., *Historical Notes and Documents*, Claremont, N. H., 1874.
Persides, N., ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΙΕΡΩΝ ΤΕΛΕΤΩΝ, second edition, Athens, 1903.
Peter Lombard, *Sententiarum Lib. IV.*, P.L. cxcii.
Peter Mansour, *De Corpore et Sanguine Christi*, P.G. xcv. *Epist. ad Zech.*, P.G. xcv.
Peter II. of Alexandria, P.G. lxxxii.
Pfalz-Neuberg, *Kirchen-Ordnung* for, Nürnberg, 1543.
*Popoff, B. (translated from the Russian by), *The History of the Council of Florence*, London, 1861.
Poore, Richard, Constitutions of, 1217 A.D., Mansi, XXII.
Preparatio Sacerdotis, Venice, 1493, in *Tracts on the Mass.*
Proclus, *De Traditione Div. Liturgiae*, P.G. lxv.
Pseudo-Alcuin, *Confessio Fidei*, P.L. ci. *De Divinis Officiis*, P.L. ci.
Pseudo-Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, P.L. xvi.
Pullan, L., *The History of the Book of Common Prayer*, third edition, London, 1901.
Quierci, Synod of, 858 A.D., Mansi, XVIII B.
Rabanus Maurus, *De Institutione Clericorum*, P.L. cvii. *Liber de Sacris Ordinibus*, etc., P.L. cxii.
Ratramn, *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, P.L. cxxi.

Rattray, Bp. Thomas, **Some Particular Instructions concerning the Christian Covenant*, etc., London, 1748; reprinted, Burntisland, at the Pitsligo Press, 1854. *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, etc., London, 1744.

*Renaudot, Eusebius, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, Editio Secunda Correctior.* Two vols., Francofurti ad Moenum, 1847.

*Reichel, O. J., *Solemn Mass at Rome in the Ninth Century*, second edition, with additions, London, 1895.

Rhobotes, P., ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΚΗ, Athens, 1869.

Riley, Athelstan, *Athos or the Mountain of the Monks*, London, 1887.

Rivière, l'Abbé J., *Le Dogme de la Rédemption*, Paris, 1905.

Rome, Council at, 1079 A.D., P.L. cxlviii.

Rouen, Synod of, 1235 A.D., Mansi, XXIII.

Rupert of Deutz, *Commentaria in Joannem*, P.L. clxix.

Samonas of Gaza, *Dialogue with Achmed the Saracen*, P.G. cxx.

Schaff, Philip, *The Creeds of Christendom*, etc., fourth edition, revised and enlarged, three vols., New York [1887].

Scotland, Provincial Council of, 1225 A.D., Statutes, Mansi, XXII.

Scudamore, W. E., *Notitia Eucharistica*, second edition, revised and enlarged, London, 1876.

Seabury, Bp. Samuel, *Discourses on Several Subjects*, two vols., Hudson, 1815.

Shields, Charles, *The Book of Common Prayer . . . as amended by the Westminster Divines . . . and in Agreement with the Directory for Public Worship of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*, Philadelphia, 1864. *Liturgia Expurgata; or, The Prayer Book amended according to the Presbyterian Revision of* 1661, *and historically and critically reviewed*, Philadelphia, 1864.

Sicard of Cremona, *Mitrale*, P.L. ccxiii.

Smend, J., *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen bis zu Luthers Deutscher Messe*, Göttingen, 1896.

*Smirnoff, P., *The Instruction in God's Law*, translated from the Russian, London, 1896.

Smith, H. W., *Life and Correspondence of the Rev. William Smith, D.D.*, two vols., Philadelphia, 1880.

*Sokoloff, D., *A Manual of the Orthodox Church's Divine Services*, translated from the Russian, New York and Albany, 1899.

Sophocles, E. A., *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Boston, 1870.

Sprott, G. W., *Euchologion, a Book of Common Order* (edited by), Edinburgh and London, 1905. *Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI.*, edited, with an Introduction and Notes,

Edinburgh and London, 1901. **The Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, commonly known as John Knox's Liturgy,* with Historical Introduction and Illustrative Notes, Edinburgh and London, 1901. **The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland,* etc., Edinburgh and London, 1882.

Srawley, J. H., *The Catechetical Oration of Gregory of Nyssa,* edited by, Cambridge, 1903.

Stephen of Autun, *Tractatus de Sacramento Altaris,* P.L. clxxii.

Stephens, Edward, *The Liturgy of the Ancients, represented, as near as well may be, in English forms* (1696). *A Complete Form of Liturgy, or Divine Service, according to the Usage of the Most Ancient Christians* (c. 1700). (Both reprinted in Vol. II. of the Rev. Peter Hall's *Fragmenta Liturgica,* Bath, 1848.)

Suicer, J. C., *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus* . . . editio tertia . . . Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1746. Two vols.

Swete, H. B., *Eucharistic Belief in the Second and Third Centuries,* in *J. Th. S.*, Vol. III., pp. 161–177 (January, 1902).

Symeon of Thessalonica, *Explanation concerning the Divine Temple,* etc., P.G. clv.

Syropulus, Sylvester, *History of the Council of Florence* (for exact title see above, p. 314).

Taylor, Bp. Jeremy, *Works,* edited by C. P. Eden, in ten vols., London, 1859–1865.

Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.*, P.L. ii.

Theodore of Andida, *Commentatio Liturgica,* P.G. cxl.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Dialogue ii., Inconfusus,* P.G. lxxxiii.

Theodulph of Orleans, *Liber de Ordine Baptismi,* P.L. cv.

Theophilus of Alexandria, *Paschal Letter,* P.L. xxii.

Theophylact, *Commentaries on Gospels, on First Corinthians,* P.G. cxxiii, cxxiv.

Thorndike, Herbert, *Works,* six vols., *A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1844–1856.

*Thurston, Herbert, S. J., *Genuflexion at Mass,* in *The Month,* October, 1897, pp. 391–406.

Tracts on the Mass, see Legg, J. Wickham.

Trent, Council of, *Canones et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici, et Generalis Concilii Tridentini,* . . . Romae, 1564.

Trèves, Provincial Council of, 1227 A.D., Mansi, XXIII.

*Washington, G., *Points of Divergence between the Anglican and Eastern Churches,* London, 1902.

Watterich, J., *Der Konsekrationsmoment im heiligen Abendmahl, und seine Geschichte,* Heidelberg, 1896.

Westcott, B. F., and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek,* two vols., New York, 1882.

Wheatly, Charles, *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer,* etc., Oxford, 1846.

White, Bp. William, *Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, edited with notes by B. F. De Costa, New York, 1880.
William of Paris, Additions to the Constitutions of Gallo, 1208 A.D., Mansi, XXII.
Williams, G., *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, etc., London, 1868.
Wilson, H. A., *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, Oxford, 1894.
Wilson, Bp. Thomas, *Works*, seven vols., *A.C.L.*, Oxford, 1847–1863.
*Wordsworth, Bp. John, *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book*, London, 1899.
Worcester, Synod of, 1240 A.D., Mansi, XXIII.
*Wotherspoon, H. J., *The Second Prayer Book of King Edward the Sixth* (1552) . . . (and *The Liturgy of Compromise* . . . edited by G. W. Sprott), Edinburgh and London, 1905.
Wriothesley, C., *A Chronicle of England*, etc., Vol. II., Camden Society, 1877.

Manuscripts

British Museum, Additional MS. 15,222, ff. 27*v*–39*r*, *Ordo Romanus*, adapted for the use of Besançon, X. Century.
British Museum, Additional MS. 17,004, ff. 108*v*–116*v*, *Ordo Romanus*, adapted for use of Amiens, c. 1050 A.D.
Bodleian MS. Lat. liturg. d. 4. [31,535], *Canon Missae*, ff. 20*r*–22*r*, Gregorian Sacramentary, Como, Italy, XI. Century.
Bodleian MS. Tanner 169*, part 3 [9995], Calendar etc., *Canon Missae* on pp. 149–150, 1188 A.D.
British Museum, Additional MS. 15,120, *Canon Missae*, ff. 135*r*–136*v*, Missal from Bergamo, Italy, XIV. Century.
British Museum, Additional MSS. 30,844; 30,845; 30,846. Mozarabic Missals (incomplete), X. Century.

INDEX

Abyssinian Anaphora of our Lord, 73–74.
Addai and Mari, Liturgy of, 73.
Agobard of Lyons, 134, 154 n. 2 : 368.
Alcuin, 131–132 : 366.
Alger of Liège, 159 : 392–393.
"Alteration and Amendment, chief," Preface *passim*, 227, 238, 241.
Amalarius, 141–142 : 371–373.
Ambrose (S.), of Milan, 46–51 : 256–257.
Ambrosian Liturgy, 49, 123 n. 1 : 358.
Anaphora,
  Apostolic, 31.
  Equivalent to *Canon Missae*, 3.
  Equivalent to Prayer of Consecration, 50.
  Two main elements of, 27–28, 33, 44–45, 117–118, 119 n. 2.
Ἀναφορά, Christ's, 28.
Anastasius Sinaita, 79 : 280.
Andrewes, Bp., 185–186.
Answer of Great Church of Constantinople to Papal Encyclical on Union, 114 : 333–334.
Antididagma, 180, 181–183, 187, 191 : 419–422.
Apostolic Constitutions, Liturgy of, 43–44, 104, 214 : 253–254.
Armenian Liturgy, 87–88, 95–96, 115 n. 1.
Arras, Synod of, 154–155 : 387.
Athanasius (S.), of Alexandria, 40 : 251.
Augustine (S), of Hippo, 63–65, 156 : 267–269.

Basil (S.), of Cæsarea, 20 n. 2, 46 : 256.
  Liturgy of, 86, 91, 105 : 289–290.
Beardsley, Rev. E. E., D.D., *Life*, etc., of Bp. Seabury, 222 n. 1, 227 n. 3, 228 n. 2.
Becon, Thomas, 174 n. 3.
Bede, Venerable, 83 : 287.
Bellarmine, 187.
Berengarian Controversy, 34 n. 3, 155.
Berengar of Tours, 150, 155–158 : 387.
Bernardakis, D. N., 113 : 332–333.
Bernold of Constance, see *Micrologus*.
Bessarion, 102, 103.
Bethune-Baker, Rev. J. H., 36 n. 1, 38 n. 1, 42 n. 1.
Bingham, Rev. Joseph, D.D., 203.
Bishop, see Gasquet and Bishop.
Book of Common Worship, 210 n. 1.
Box, Rev. G. H., 29 n. 4.
Bramhall, Abp., 191.
Brentz, John, 177.
Brett, Bp. Thomas, 98 n. 2, 200 n. 2, 214, 215–217, 236 n. 2.
Brightman, Rev. F. E., *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, 13, 28 nn. 1 and 2, 41 n. 1, 45 n. 3, 70 n. 2, 73 n. 2, 89 nn. 2 and 4, 117 n. 4, 161 n. 2.
Bruno of Segni, 161–162 : 389.
Bucer, 183, 204.
Burbidge, Rev. Edward, 123 n. 2, 128 n. 3.
Burckard, John, see *Ordo Missae*.

Cabasilas, Nicholas (Abp. of Thessalonica), 91–96, 187 : 296–306.
Cabrol, Dom F., 3 n. 3, 49 n. 3, 50 n. 1.
Cæsarius of Arles, 76–78 : 278–279.
Cajetan, Cardinal James, 171, 173 : 400–403.
Calvin, John, 206.
Campbell, Bp. Archibald, 200 n. 3, 214, 219–220.

Canon Missae,
Analysis, of, 126–131.
Considered equivalent to Anaphora, 3, 50 n. 1.
Considered equivalent to *Confirmatio Sacramenti*, 131.
Considered equivalent to Words of Declaration only, 177–178.
Discussed, 122–131.
Invocation in, see *Supplices te*.
Rationale of, original, 34, 131, 144–145, 156–157.
Rationale of, perverted, 129, 146–149, 150, 153–154.
Text of, 123–126 : 359–361.
Carlstadt, 177 : 413.
Caroline Books, 87, 132–133 : 366–367.
Carthusian Statutes, 166–167 : 395.
Catechism, see Bernardakis, Forbes (Robert), Persides, Russian.
Chosroes, the Great, 87–88 : 291–292.
Christ,
Blessed the elements; consecrated the Eucharist by prayer, 25, 26, and n. 1, 27–29, 54 and n. 3, 55, 64, 67, 76–77, 95, 108–109, 134, 186–187, 187–188, 191, 192–193, 195, 196, 197, 204, 205–206, 212, 215, 240–241, 242.
Taught His disciples to consecrate by prayer, 28–29, 40 n. 3, 108, 135.
Chrysostom (S.), John, 50 nn. 3 and 4, 56–59, 92–93 : 261–263.
Liturgy of, 86, 91, 105 : 287–289.
Church Quarterly Review, The, 70 n. 1, 119 n. 2, 180 n. 2, 181 n. 1, 185 n. 1.
Church Times, The, 185 n. 1.
Ciconiolanus, see *Directorium*.
Clement of Alexandria, 28 n. 4 : 249.
Clermont, Synod of, 170 : 398–399.
Cologne, Synod of, 170 : 399.
Chapter of, see *Antididagma*.
Collier, Bp. Jeremy, 214, 236 n. 2.
Conformatio (*Confirmatio*) *Sacramenti*, 81, 121, 131 : 282, 354, 366.
Confusion of Institution and Observance, 129, 149–150, 155, 158.
Consecration of Eucharist,
Effected by the Church's prayer or Invocation, 8–9, 13, 18, 36–37, 39–40, 45, 50–51, 53–54, 58, 60, 62, 76–77, 92–94, 97–98, 101, 104, 106–107, 109, 111, 113, 122, 131, 133, 145, 187, 189, 190–191, 193–194, 201–203, 204, 206, 209, 211–212, 242.
"Form" of,
American, Preface, *passim*, 16 and n. 1, 17–18, 241–242.
Apostolic, 30–33, 214, 225.
Early Church, 13, 33, 49 and n. 3, 199, 202, 212–213, 225.
Eastern unbroken tradition, 34 n. 1, 91 *seq.*, 97–98, 106–108, 110–111, 114.
English, 16 n. 1, 17, 186, 205–206, 224, 230, 241, 431–433.
Gallican, 78, 116–118, 122.
Mozarabic, 80–82, 118–119, 121–122.
Nonjurors', 211, 214–220.
Roman (Scholastic), 34 and n. 3, 38, 47, 54, 76, 80 and n. 3, 92–95, 100–101, 110, 113–114, 115, 129, 142, 146 *seq.*, 175, 185, 187, 195–197, 199, 201, 203, 225, 228.
Scottish, 16 n. 1, 17, 18, 205, 209, 225.
Holy Spirit, why invoked in, 66, 74–76 : 270–271, 277–278.
Not effected by recitation of Narrative of Institution, 18, 38 n. 3, 47, 57, 93–95, 104, 109, 136, 192, 228.
Not regarded as completed until end of Invocation proper, 8, 18, 49 and n. 3, 50–51, 69–70.
Rationale of, in New Testament, 19–33.
Rubrics or Regulations governing Second Consecration, 16–18, 185–186, 205–206, 209, 232–233, 241–242.
Constantinople, Council of (754 A.D.), 85 : 285–286.
Cooper, Rev. James, 208 n. 4, 210 n. 1.
Coptic Jacobites, Liturgy of, 117 n. 4, 126 n. 2.

Corinthians, First Epistle to,
x. 16, 29–30.
xi. 23–26, 4, 19, 22–23, 76, 180, 182, 209.
xiv. 16, 17, 30.
Cosin, Bp. John, 8 n. 1, 98 n. 2, 189–190.
Crakanthorp, Dr. Richard, 98 n. 2, 186–187.
Cranmer, Abp. Thomas, 4, 5, 7, 175–180, 183, 184, 234.
Cyprian (S.), of Carthage, 39 : 250–251.
Cyril (S.), of Alexandria, 20 n. 2, 66–67 : 270–271.
Cyril (S.), of Jerusalem, 44–45, 49, 80, 116 : 254–255.

Damascene (S.), John, 83–85 : 283–285.
Deacon, Bp. Thomas, 214, 217–218.
Holy Liturgy of, 217, 427–428.
Delisle, M. Léopold, 143 n. 1.
De Vert, Dom Claude, 138 n. 2, 142 n. 1, 158 n. 2.
De Vignay, Jean, 173 and n. 2.
Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie, 3 n. 3, 49 n. 3, 50 n. 1, 117 n. 4, 132 n. 2.
Didache, The, 35 n. 1.
Dionysius bar Salibi, 89 : 294.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 39–40 : 251.
Directorium Divinorum Officiorum, 173 n. 3, 408–409.
Dowden, Bp. John, 190 n. 2, 208 n. 4, 210 n. 1, 215 n. 1, 219 n. 1, 228 n. 1.
Duchesne, Mgr. L., 47 n. 1, 49 n. 2, 116 n. 2, 128 n. 1, 129–130, 138 n. 3.
Duns Scotus, see Scotus.
Durandus of Mende, 160 : 394.
Durandus of Troarn, 156 : 388.

Ebner, Dr. Adalbert, 3 n. 3.
Egyptian Rite, 117 n. 4, 126 n. 2.
Elevation, see Gestures.
Ephraem Syrus, 59–60 : 263–264.
Epiklesis, see Invocation.
Ἐπίκλησις, Christ's, 28.
Erigena, John Scotus, 155.
Ethiopic Church Ordinances, 40–41.
Eucharist,
Distinguished from Passover, 21, 24–27.
How consecrated by Christ, 26–27.
How consecrated by Church, 13, 31–33, 36, 39.
Instituted by Christ after Passover, 19–29.
Rationale of Christ's, 25–27.
See also Christ, Consecration of Eucharist.
Εὐλογεῖν, 25, 27–30, 193, 199.
Εὐλογία, 28, 29, 197.
Eusebius Bruno, 156 : 388.
Eusebius of Alexandria, 79 : 279.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 20 n. 2, 40 n. 3 : 251.
Eustratius Argentes, 29, 108–109, 110 n. 1 : 324–330.
Eutychius of Constantinople, 79 : 279–280.
Εὐχαριστεῖν, 25, 27–28, 30, 193, 199.
Εὐχαριστία, 27–28, 30, 197.
Εὐχολόγιον τὸ μέγα, 111 : 330–331.
Exeter, Synod of, 170–171 : 400.

Falconer, Bp. W., 221.
Firmilian of Cæsarea, 39 : 250.
Florence, Council of, 98–104, 115 n. 1 : 311–316.
Florus, 129 n. 1, 150–153 : 381–385.
Forbes, Bp. Robert, 221.
Forbes, Bp. William, 190–191.
Frankfort, Council of, 87, 132.
Frankland, Rev. W. B., 20 n. 2.
Frere-Procter, 123 n. 2, 128 nn. 1 and 3, 141 n. 2.
Froude, see *Tracts for the Times*.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, 75–76, 277–278.

Gabriel of Philadelphia, 105 : 323–324.
Gallican Liturgy, 78, 87, 116–118, 122, 131.
Gasquet and Bishop, 5 n. 2.
Gaudentius of Brescia, 68 : 272.
Gee, Rev. Henry, D.D., 185.
Gelasius I., Pope, 74, 128 : 276–277.
Genuflection, see Gestures.
Gerbert, Dom Martin, 143 nn. 2, 3 and 4.

German (Lutheran) Church Orders,
Brandenburg-Nürnberg, 1533, 5, 7, 177, 180.
Carlstadt, for Wittenberg, 1522, 177 : 413.
Herman's *Deliberatio*, 180–181, 183.
Hertzog Heinrich, 1539, 180.
Hesse-Cassel, 1539, 180.
Kaspar Kantz, 1522, 179 : 415–417.
Luther's *Formula Missae*, 1523, 177 : 414–415.
Pfalz-Neuberg, 1543, 179–180 : 418–419.
Strassburg, 1524, 179 n. 3 : 417.
Gestures connected with the Invocation,
Low bow at opening of, 13, 72, 140–145 *passim*, 276, 363, 365, 373, 375, 408, 411.
Still persists in *Canon Missae*, 141 n. 1.
Prostration after the Invocation, 107.
Gestures in the Narrative of Institution,
Mimetic,
Bread and cup picked up, 6–7, 70–71, 140, 144, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166.
Cross, sign of, made over them, 139–140, 144, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166.
Fraction of Bread, 6, 7, 8, 174 n. 4, 184 n. 1.
Perversion of,
Distinction made between picking up and holding aloft, 165, 166, 167–171.
Elevation of host, 155, 159, 165, 180.
Not to be made till after *Hoc est corpus meum*, 167–171.
Prohibited, 2, 7, 174.
Exaggeration and prolonging of picking up elements, 8–9, 158, 163, 164, 165.
Inclination or bow after *Hoc est corpus meum*, 171–172.
Exaggeration of this new gesture, 172–173.
Genuflection developed out of bow, 173.
Not ordered in England, 174.
Stereotyped in Pian Missal, 174.
Gillespie, 210 n. 1.
Gore, Bp., 35 n. 1, 146 n. 1, 150 n. 1, 154 n. 3.
Grabe, Dr. John Ernest, 200–203.
Greeks, Declaration of, to Marquis de Nointel, 105–107 : 323.
Gregory Dialogos, Liturgy of, 184 n. 1.
Gregory of Nyssa, 32 n. 2, 50 n. 4, 60–63 : 265–266.
Gregory the Great, Pope, 78–79, 128 : 280–281.
Guitmund of Aversa, 156 : 388.

Handbook, A, treating of the Seven Mysteries, 110 : 330.
Hart, Rev. Samuel, D.D., 228 nn. 1 and 2.
Hayward, 188.
Headlam, Rev. A. C., 110 n. 2.
Henry de Segusia, 178 : 413–414.
Herman von Wied, 180, 183.
Hickes, Bp. George, 31 n. 1, 200, 213–214.
Hildebert of Tours, 163, 165 : 390.
Honorius III., Pope, 168 : 396.
Honorius of Autun, 162 : 389–390.
Hooker, Rev. Richard, 26 n. 1.
Hoppe, Dr. Ludwig Augustin, 25 n. 1, 127–128, 141 n. 1, 145–146.
Hort, Dr. F. J. A. (see also Westcott and Hort), 27 n. 1.
Hugo of S. Victor, 164–165 : 391–392.

Iconoclastic Council, see Constantinople, Council of.
Illation, Invocation in, see Invocation.
Indutus Planeta, 173 n. 3 : 408.
Institution, Narrative of, see Narrative.
Institution of Eucharist, see Eucharist.
Introduction, An, etc., 240–241.

Invocation, The,
American, meaning and purpose of, 13–18, 231–234.
American identical with Scottish in meaning, 14–18, 231–234, 432, 433.
Forms of,
Anglican, 13–15, 176, 185, 189–190, 194–195, 199, 204, 207–209, 214–215, 224–225, 231–238, 240–241, 424, 426, 428, 430, 435, 436.
Eastern, 41–44, 72–74 : 252–253, 254, 276, 288–289, 290.
German, 179–180, 416–418.
Presbyterian forms of, 210 n. 1.
Western, 56, 78, 116–121, 124, 125 : 260, 279, 334–358, 361,
Normal position of, 175, 213. 215 n. 2, 216–217.
Precedes Narrative sometimes, 117–119, 179–180, 350, 351, 353, 358, 416–418.
Preliminary additional Invocation, 42, 54, 117 n. 4, 124, 143, 175, 178, 360.
Restored in 1789, Preface, *passim*, 229.
Title indented, 13.
Irenæus (S.), 36–38, 63, 183 : 248–249.
Isidore of Kieff, 101–102, 103 : 313–314, 315–316.
Isidore of Pelusium, 66 : 270.
Isidore of Seville, 13 n. 1, 80–82, 115–116, 122 n. 4, 131 : 282–283.

Jacobs, Dr. H. E., 5 n. 2, 177 n. 1.
James of Edessa, 82–83 : 287.
James (S.), Liturgy of, 3, 70–73, 105, 214 : 273–276.
James (S.), Liturgy of, Syriac, 70.
Jerome, 65–66 : 269–270.
Jerome (the Greek), 66 : 270.
Jerusalem, Liturgy of, see S. Cyril of Jerusalem.
Jewish Encyclopaedia, The, 27 n. 2.
John (S.), vi. 11, 67 : 271.
vi. 48–52, 88 : 293.
vi. 49–52, 47.
vi. 63, 221.
Johnson, John, 27 n. 2, 112 n. 1, 211–213, 214.
Journals of General Convention, 229 n. 1, 236 n. 2, 237 n. 1.
Justin Martyr (S.), 28, 30, 35–36 : 247–248.

Kantz, Kaspar, of Nördlingen, 179 : 415–417.
Kidd, Rev. B. J., 4 nn. 1 and 2.
Kings, First Book of, xviii. 36–38, 50 n. 2.

Lambert, Rev. J. C., 20 n. 2.
Lathbury, Rev. T., 215 n. 1.
Laud, Abp., 1, 2, 8 n. 1, 208, 210.
Le Brun, R. P. Pierre, 34 n. 2, 96 n. 1, 98 n. 2, 146 n. 3, 176 n. 1.
Leofric Missal, 3.
L'Estrange, Hamon, 199–200.
Liber Ordinum, 118 nn. 2 and 3, 121 : 354–358.
Lichoudi, Sophronius and Joannicius, 107.
Lombard, Peter, see Peter Lombard.
Luke (S.), i. 3, 24.
ix. 16, 67 : 271.
xxii. 14–20, 5, 19, 20–24.
xxii. 19, 66 : 270–271.
Luther, Martin, 177–179 : 414–415.

Malzew, Alexios, 107 n. 3.
Manual Acts, see Gestures.
Manuel, Great Rhetor, 91 : 296.
Mark (S.), xiv. 22–25, 19, 21–24.
Liturgy of, 117 n. 4, 126 n. 2.
Mass, Canon of, see *Canon Missae*.
Materialistic Theology of Eucharist, 146 and nn. 1 and 2, 154.
Matt. (S.), xv. 11, 32 n. 2, 38 : 249.
xxvi. 26–29, 5, 19, 21–24, 110.
xxvi. 26, 67, 199 : 271.
Maxwell, Bp. John, 208.
Mayence, Council of, 170 : 398.
Medvedeff, Sylvester, 107.
Memorial, Idea of in Eucharist, 10–13.
Micrologus, 142, 161 : 374–375.
Missal, Bergamo, 143 n. 5.
Mozarabic, 118–122 : 339–354.
Pian, 167 n. 2, 172, 174 : 410–411.
Roman (1555), 173 n. 3 : 409–410.
Missale Francorum, 3.

Missale Gallicanum Vetus, 338–339.
Missale Gothicum, 118 : 335–338.
Missale Plenum (XII. century), 141 n. 4 : 365.
Missale Richenovense, 116–117 : 334–335.
Morton, Bp. Thomas, 187–188.
Moschus, John, 79–80 : 281–282.
Mouravieff, A. N., 107 n. 2.
Munster, Council of, 170 : 399.

Narrative of Institution,
  Combined with the Oblation, 41–42.
  New Testament accounts, 19–29.
    Rationale of, 24–27, 29, 161.
    Table of, 22–23.
  Omitted, 73.
  Passed over, 45, 81–82.
  Quoted historically in Liturgies, 33, 41–42, 45, 53–54, 73, 92–93, 98, 104–105, 109–113, 118, 127, 132, 139–140, 188, 193–195, 201, 203.
  Quoted historically in Prayer of Consecration, 4–9, 33, 242.
  Text of, in Liturgies, 41–43, 54–55, 70–71, 74, 124–125 : 252–253, 259, 274–275, 288, 289, 339–340, 355, 360, 416–417, 419, 422, 423, 425–426, 427, 429.
  Text of, in Prayer of Consecration, Preface, xxiv, 5–7.
  Warrant or Charter of Eucharistic Observance, 9, 18, 33, 50–51, 58, 80.
Neale, Rev. J. M., D.D., 343 n. 1.
Nestle, Dr. Eberhard, 22–24.
Nestorian Liturgy, see Addai and Mari.
Nicæa, Council of (787 A.D.), 85–86 : 286.
Nicholas Cabasilas, see Cabasilas.
Nicholas I., Pope, 134 : 369.
Nilus, 63 : 267.
Nonjurors,
  Liturgy of, 3, 214–215, 424–426.
  Theology of, 211, 214–221, 233–234.
Norwich, Statutes of, 169–170 : 398.

Oath of Russian Bishop, 107 : 323.
Oblation, The,
  Combined with Narrative, 41–42.
  Forms of,
    Anglican, 9–12, 423–424, 426, 427, 429–430.
    Eastern, 41, 42, 43–44, 71, 73, 74 : 252, 253, 275, 288, 289–290.
    Western, 56, 116–121, 125 : 260, 335–358, 360–361.
  Rationale of, 9–13.
  Relation to the Invocation, 13.
  Restored in 1789, Preface, *passim*, 229.
  Title indented, 12.
Odo of Cambray, 162 : 388–389.
Odo of Paris, 167 : 395–396.
Optatus of Milevis, 46 : 255.
Ordo Missae, of John Burckard, 173 : 406–407.
Ordo Missarum, 139 n. 3 : 365.
Ordo Romanus I., 137–138, 139, 141 : 362.
Ordo Romanus I. (edited by Atchley), 137 n. 3, 138 n. 3, 139 n. 4.
Ordo Romanus II., 139–140 : 363.
Ordo Romanus XIV., 171–173 : 400–403.
Ordo Romanus, Amand (S.), 138–139 : 364.
Ordo Romanus, Amiens, 139 : 365.
Ordo Romanus, Besançon, 139 : 364–365.
Origen, 32 n. 1, 38–39 : 249–250.
Orthodox Confession, 105–106, 110 n. 4 : 321–322.
Osiander, 7, 177.
Overton, Rev. J. H., D.D., 215 n. 1.
Oxford, Council of, 168–169 : 396–397.

Paléographie Musicale, 123 n. 2, 141 n. 2.
Parker, James, 190 n. 2.
Paschasius Radbertus, 146–150, 154 n. 1 : 376–381.
Passover, Last, distinct from Eucharist, 21, 24–25.
Paul (S.), 24, 29–32.
Paul Winifred, 79 : 280–281.
Persides, N., 110 n. 4 : 334.
Peter Lombard, 159–160 : 393.

Peter Mansour, 85 : 285.
Peter Martyr, 183.
Peter II. of Alexandria, 60 : 264.
Poore, Bp. Richard, Constitutions of, 168 : 396.
Post Mysterium, 116 : 336, 338.
Post Pridie, 116 n. 2, 119–123 : 131–132 : 340–358.
Post Sanctus, 3, 78, 116–119, 121 : 350, 351, 353, 358.
Post Secreta, 116–117 : 335–339.
Prayer of Consecration, The,
  Deficiency of English, Preface, *passim*, 184 and n. 1, 200–203, 224–225, 228, 230.
  Equivalent parts of other Liturgies, 40–44, 54–56, 70–74, 116, 121 : 252–254, 259–260, 273–276, 287–290, 339–340, 354–355, 359–361, 415–419, (422), 423–430.
  Name, why appropriate, 1, 2.
  Name emphasized in 1892, 2.
  Name first given, 1–2, 6.
  Normal sequence of parts, 213, 215 n. 2, 216–217, 225.
  Primitive sequence of parts, 215 n. 2, 225, 239, 242.
  Rationale of, 16, 18, cf. 217–220, 225, 231–235, 238, 240.
  Restoration of Oblation and Invocation in 1789, Preface, *passim*, 229, 238, 241.
  Scottish, used by Rev. William Smith, 224–227.
  Scottish and American forms identical in purport and rationale, 231–235, 238, cf. 432, 433.
  Text and Phraseology examined, 1–18.
  Title, where found, 1–2.
  Variant uses of Title,
    equals Invocation only, 18 n. 1.
    equals Invocation *par excellence*, 18.
    includes Narrative also, 1, 2.
    includes Narrative, Oblation, and Invocation, 16 and n. 1.
  See also, Invocation, Oblation, and Narrative.
Prayer of Humble Access misplaced, 3.
Proclus, 68 : 272.
Pseudo-Alcuin, 154 n. 2 : 385–386.
Pseudo-Ambrose, 51–56 : 258–260.
Pullan, Rev. L., 208 n. 4.

Quaestiones V. et N. Testamenti, 128 n. 1 : 251–252.
Quam oblationem, 124, 126, 143 : 360.
Quierci, Council of, 142, 155 : 374.
Qui pridie, 124–125 : 360. See also *Canon Missae*.
  Christ alleged to respeak His words in, 149, 152, 158.
  Rationale of, 118, 135–136.
  Rubrics in, see Gestures.

Rabanus Maurus, 135–137, 157 : 369–371.
Ratramn, 150, 155 : 375–376.
Rattray, Bp. Thomas, 3, 7, 8 n. 2, 218–219, 428–430.
Rhobotes, P., 111–113 : 331–332.
Riley, Mr. Athelstan, 184 n. 1.
Rivière, l'Abbé J., 20 n. 2.
Roman Mistake *in re* Eucharistic Consecration, 110, 113, 114.
  When it arose, 146–154.
Romans, xv. 16, 30–31, 213–214.
Rome, Council of, 155 : 387.
Rouen, Synod of, 169 : 397.
Rubric (e) in Narrative, significance of, 8 and n. 2.
Rubrics in Invocation, 7, 426, 428, 430.
Rubrics in Narrative, 2, 6–8, 425, 427, 429.
  Significance of, 7–9, 174 n. 4, 184 n. 1.
Rubrics in Oblation, 427.
Rubrics preceding Prayer of Consecration, 1–2, 6.
Rupert of Deutz, 152 n. 1 : 393.
Russian Church, *Longer Catechism* of, 110–111.

Sacramentary of S. Blaise, 143.
Sacramentary, Gallican, 116 n. 2.
Sacramentary, Gelasian, 3, 122–126 : 359–361.
Sacramentary, Gregorian, 143 n. 5.
Sacramentary of Gellona, 3.
Sacramentary of Serapion, 41–43, 63–64, 117 n. 4, 126 n. 2 : 252–253.

Sacrifice,
Definition of, Isidore of Seville, 80, 116, 150 : 283.
Definition of, Rabanus Maurus, 135 : 369.
Essential element of, 12–13.
Eucharistic, 4, 9–12, 211–212, 213–214, 217–218, 219–220, 227, 239–240.
Sadler, Rev. M. F., 25 n. 1.
Samonas of Gaza, 88 : 292–293.
Sancroft, Abp., 14–15, 190 n. 2.
Sanctus, 3, 9, 16 n. 1, 45.
Sarum Use, 7, 174 : 412.
Savoy Conference, 210.
Schaff, Rev. Philip, D.D., 206 n. 2, 207 n. 1.
Scotist view of Eucharistic Consecration, 181, 183.
Scotland, Provincial Council of, 169 : 397.
Scotus, Duns, 176 n. 1 : 403–404.
Scudamore, Rev. W. E., 9 n. 1, 14 n. 4, 25 n. 1, 32 n. 3, 178 n. 2, 343 n. 1.
Seabury, Bp. Samuel,
Concordate, 222–223.
Letter to Bp. White, 228–229.
Second Charge, 227.
Sermon on Eucharist, 239–240.
Sets forth Communion Office, 2, 8, 10–17, 227–228.
Seabury, Rev. W. J., D.D., 226 n. 2, 231 n. 1, 430–434.
Shields, Rev. Charles W., 210 n. 1.
Sicard of Cremona, 163 n. 1 : 394.
Smend, Dr. Julius, 179 n. 2.
Sprott, Rev. G. W., 207 n. 2.
Srawley, Rev. J. H., 62 n. 1.
Stephen of Autun, 164 : 391.
Stephens, Rev. Edward, Liturgy of, 215 n. 2, 423–424.
Suicer, 28, nn. 1 and 2.
Summary and Conclusion, 238, 241–243.
Supplices te, 125 : 361.
Cabasilas on, 94–95 : 303–305.
Duchesne on, 129–130.
Equivalent to Greek Invocation, 99–101, 127–133, 138–139, 143, 148, 153–154, 156–160.
Hoppe on, 127 nn. 1 and 2, 145–146.
Stumbling-block to Roman Catholic writers, 153.
Symbolical phraseology of, 127–130, 133.
Textual variants of, 128 n. 2 : 362.
Sursum Corda, 3, 16 n. 1, 39, 44, 64, 82, 92.
Swete, Rev. Henry, D.D., 27 n. 1, 28 n. 1.
Symeon of Thessalonica, 96–98 : 306–311.
Syropulus, Sylvester, 102–103 : 314–316.

Taylor, Bp. Jeremy, 191–195, 214.
Tertullian, 20 n. 2, 38 : 250.
Theodore of Andida, 90 : 295.
Theodoret of Cyrus, 68–69 : 272–273.
Theodulph of Orleans, 133–134 : 367–368.
Theophilus of Alexandria, 63 : 267.
Theophylact, 88 : 293.
Thomist view of Eucharistic Consecration, 176, 186.
Thorndike, Rev. Herbert, 26 n. 1, 27 n. 2, 32 n. 3, 195–198, 214.
Timothy, First, iv. 4, 5, 31–32, 148 n. 2.
Tracts for the Times (No. 63), 18 n. 1.
Trent, Council of, 26 n. 1.
Trèves, Council of, 169 : 397.
Tridentine Missal, see Missal, Pian.

Unde et Memores, 12, 125, 127, 135–136, 157 : 360.

Verba Testamenti, 177.

Warrant, Christ's, see Words of Institution, cf. Narrative of Institution.
Watterich, Dr. Johannes, 25 n. 1, 119 n. 3.
Wedderburne, Bp. James, 1, 2, 208.
Westminster Directory, 209.
Wheatly, Rev. Charles, 203–206, 240 n. 2.
White, Bp. William, 228–230, 234–238.
William of Paris, 168 : 396.
Williams, Rev. George, 215 n. 1.

Wilson, Bp. Thomas, 198–199.
Witness, Patristic, Chapter III., pp. 34 *seq.*
Incidental character of, 34, 69.
Liturgical, Eastern, 40–45, 70–74.
Liturgical, Western, 49–51, 53–56, 115–145.
Worcester, Synod of, 169 : 398.
Word, may mean the Holy Spirit, 36 n. 1, 41–42.
Word, prayer of the, 36 and n. 1.
Word, the Personal, 36–37, 40–42, 57, 61–65, 74, 83–84.
Words, Christ's,
of Declaration, 9, 25, 26, 36, 38.
Misused, 149, 152, 154, 228.
Recitation of, does not consecrate Eucharist, 38 n. 3, 41, 47, 53–54, 57, 108–111, 113, 136, 142.
of Institution and Declaration become effectual at each Eucharist through the Church's Prayer or Invocation, 8–9, 33, 50–51, 53–54, 57–60, 77–78, 83–84, 91–94, 97–98, 100–105, 148 n. 2, 242.
of Institution or Command, 9, 18, 25, 37, 50–52, 58, 89–90.
Words of Consecration (so called), 17, 188, 205, cf. 208.
Wriothesley's Chronicle, 178–179.

Ximenes, Cardinal, 118, 121.